The Office of this JOURNAL *and of the* WEEKLY REPORTER *is now at* 12, *Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.*

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *is—Town,* 26*s. Country* 28*s.; with the* WEEKLY REPORTER, 52*s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth,* 2*s.* 6*d., half law calf,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH 16, 1872.

THE CASE of Mr. Chaffers and his attacks upon Sir Travers and Lady Twiss cannot but give rise to some reflections more serious than agreeable.

It is far from pleasant to be convinced that there are people willing to make the most horrible charges against their neighbours in the most deliberate manner, at the imminent risk of heavy punishment at the hands of the criminal law. Assuming for a moment that every charge made against Sir Travers or Lady Twiss was strictly true, Mr. Chaffers, as a lawyer, must have known perfectly well that this fact would have afforded him no protection at the bar of the Old Bailey, unless he could further allege and prove "that it was for the public benefit that the matters charged should be published, and the particular fact or facts whereby it was for the public benefit that the matters charged should be published." What Mr. Chaffers's chance of proving such allegations would have been our readers can judge for themselves. We can only say, it is alarming to find that such a risk is not sufficient to prevent the publication of such libels.

Nor is it less alarming to be shown how the system of statutory declarations may be abused; whether through the defects of the law, or through the negligence of magistrates. It is perfectly monstrous that an act like that of 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 62, the very object of which was "the more entire suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths and affidavits," and which clearly contemplated the use of statutory declarations only in certain classes of cases and for certain legitimate purposes, should be applied for such an object as it now has been, simply to emphasise a libel. The Act, having, by s. 13, expressly prohibited extra-judicial oaths before magistrates, and provided for the use of a declaration in many specific cases in which affidavits had previously been in use, goes on to enact in sec. 20—

> "And whereas it may be necessary and proper in many cases not herein specified to require confirmation of written instruments or allegations, or proof of debts, or of the execution of deeds or other matters; be it therefore further enacted, that it shall and may be lawful for any justice of the peace to take and receive the declaration of any person voluntarily making the same before him in the form in the schedule to this Act annexed."

Now if the enacting words of this section had stood alone it would probably hardly have been open to any construction but that a magistrate was bound to receive any declaration voluntarily tendered before him. But the enacting words must be read with the recital. And so read, it appears to us that a magistrate may and ought before receiving a declaration to be satisfied that it is necessary and proper so to do for any of the purposes specified in the recital or some other purpose *ejusdem generis*. This view is taken, we know, by many magistrates, and the practice at their courts is framed accordingly. At the Mansion House, for instance, as will be seen in other column, careful rules are framed to prevent abuse. But many magistrates either take a different view of their duties, or are sadly negligent in the discharge of them, as Mr. Chaffers's declaration only too plainly shows. One thing at least is clear—that the abuse requires an immediate remedy. If the law be in fault, as we think it is not, it should be altered. If magistrates or their clerks are in fault, as we think they are, they must be required to exercise more care for the future.

IF THE GOVERNMENT want an example to strengthen their hands in acting firmly and decisively in the matter of judicial reforms, they have found it in what occurred at Maidstone the other day. An important road indictment, which had stood over from the previous assizes because there was not time to try it then, was again postponed till next assizes, because there is not time to try it now, and this in spite of the vigorous protests on the part of the prosecutor, who does not see why he should have to pay the costs of a trial three times over because the judges and other officers do not choose, in arranging the circuits, to make proper provision for dealing with the work to be done. Is it any wonder if the public refuse to have much to do with courts of justice, and prefer to suffer wrong rather than appeal to the law, when they see such grievous injustice perpetrated, and that just after three judges have been added to the bench?

Mr. CAVE'S BILL, to provide for a commission of inquiry into the circumstances of the failure of the Albert and European Life Offices, was read a second time this week, in Mr. Cave's absence, under a general arrangement that the question of the merits of the bill, which ordinarily would have been debated on the motion for second reading, should be discussed in the committee, which was fixed for the 10th of April. Mr. Cave does a great public service in bringing forward this bill.

THE SECOND READING of the Justices' Clerks (Salaries) Bill was moved on Wednesday, but the dinner-hour arriving in mid-debate, the motion stood adjourned by the rules of the House. We shall be glad to see this measure passed into law; but in spite of the withdrawal of a couple of clauses by Mr. Magniac it has still serious defects in draftsmanship * which will need amending in committee. The repealing section is an extremely awkward one, and would probably create troublesome doubts. The same also may be said of the section relating to clerks being directly or indirectly engaged in business before the sessions. One part of this latter section will be very awkward if the Public Prosecutors Bill should not pass. It might be as well, therefore, if the committee could be postponed till the fate of the Public Prosecutors Bill can be predicted with certainty.

LAST YEAR the Government Ballot Bill proposed to transfer election expenses from the candidates to the constituencies, but that provision having been rejected by a largish majority, it was not renewed in the bill of this session. The subject, however, is brought up again, in different directions, by Mr. Torrens and Mr. Fawcett. Mr. Torrens proposed to throw the burden on the Consolidated Fund, but the House rejected that proposal by an overwhelming majority of more than 300. There are, indeed, the strongest possible objections against the resort to the Consolidated Fund, though, as an hon. member observed during the debate, there seems a notion afloat that the Consolidated Fund is "a perennial source of wealth, kept full by the bounty of nature." Mr. Fawcett's proposal, which is supported by the Government, of throwing the burden on the rates is yet to come on. For this there is very much more to be said.

* *Vide ante* p. 319.

A PARAGRAPH which has appeared in some of the morning papers under the heading "The Dual Functions of the Lord Chancellor" would seem to call for some notice from us. We have for many years called attention, from time to time, to the absurd accumulation of offices filled by the Lord Chancellor, and in particular have urged the expediency of separating his political functions as Minister of Justice from the purely judicial office of head of the Court of Chancery, which latter ought to be made a permanent office tenable during good behaviour, like any other judgeship. If the Speakership of the House of Lords were attached to the latter post, which should also carry with it the minor patronage exclusively affecting the Court of Chancery, while the political and administrative functions now discharged by the Lord Chancellor, together with the extensive legal and ecclesiastical patronage now vested in him as a high officer of State, were transferred to the "Secretary of State for Justice" (or by whatever name the new minister might be termed),—the division of labour would be natural and complete, and all the inevitable inconveniences of the present system—some striking instances of which were mentioned in the paragraph already referred to—might be successfully avoided. Nor would the extra cost—the single consideration by which we would seem at present to be swayed—be really appreciable; for the rapid succession of Chancellors, which is inseparable from our present system, would cease under the altered arrangement, and the saving in pensions would in a very short time compensate for the extra salary required. It would even be possible, by a most obvious and natural arrangement, to avoid the supposed pecuniary difficulty from the very start.

But the Lord Chancellor is not the only officer who, as matters now stand, is overloaded with a mass of heterogeneous duties. The Attorney-General is another legal "servant-of-all-work," a large portion of whose functions ought to be attached to the office of the Minister of Justice, and discharged either by himself or the under-secretary for the department. This would enable the Attorney-General duly to discharge the duties properly incident to his office, as leading advocate and law adviser of the Crown, instead of being, as he now is, required to act as superintendent of a number of administrative departments—such as charities, patents, &c.—which have no direct connection with that office. At present it is quite hopeless to expect any Attorney-General to get through his public duties with anything like efficiency, particularly when it is taken into account that the emoluments of the office are not sufficient to induce men in large practice to accept it, except upon the terms of continuing their private practice, and that, at least in important cases, the private duty is pretty sure to be found the more pressing. Of this there has recently been a very notable instance.

But if these accumulations of various duties, which have gradually overgrown certain ancient offices, are thus objectionable, what shall we say of the deliberate sacrifice of the efficiency of our whole system of bankruptcy to the incalculable injury of the whole commercial community, for the sake of saving the salaries of a few judges? Yet, to say nothing of the obvious absurdity of attempting to combine the office of Chief Judge in Bankruptcy with that of Vice-Chancellor—which practically results in handing over the duties of Chief Judge to the registrars, and reducing the functions of the judge hearing appeals from the county courts, a result most certainly neither desired nor desirable—we think that none of our readers who have seen Mr. Daniel's letter to us on the management of the bankruptcy business in the county courts will have failed to perceive that the endeavour to combine in the same individual the duties of presiding over a court at common law in perpetual circuit and an administrative tribunal in continual action, has necessarily resulted in the systematic delegation of the duties of one or other kind, or more or less of both, to subordinate—and therefore, having regard to their numbers, inevitably inferior—hands.

How long shall we continue to submit to a system which places the practical administration of the law in the hands of registrars and chief clerks, superintended as far as possible, but certainly not controlled, by an inadequate staff of judges borne down by a multiplicity of conflicting duties?

THE RESOLUTION moved by Mr. Osborne Morgan respecting the Welsh county court judges was a truism, even taken without the amendment of Mr. Hanbury-Tracy's, which seemed to smooth it for acceptance by the Government. No one can say that it is *not* "desirable that the judge of a county court district in which the Welsh language is generally spoken should be able to speak and understand that language;" and the amending qualification—"as far as the limits of selection will allow"—merely adds what otherwise *va sans dire*. Mr. Bruce, on behalf of the Government, acknowledged all that profusely; he even vied with Mr. Osborne Morgan and his Welsh supporters in arguments to back up theirs; in short, the appointments which gave rise to the complaints being past and settled, and Mr. Homersham Cox provided for, Mr. Bruce seemed inclined to promise anything and everything on behalf of the present, and indeed, he was sure he might say, "all future Governments."

There needed no droll stories of miscarriages of interpreted justice to prove that it is desirable that Welsh county court judges should understand the suitors' language. The point is, that it would be difficult for Mr. Morgan to find Welsh-speaking barristers of legal calibre and character equal to the office. But if Mr. Homersham Cox was as good as, say better than, anyone who could have been found if the selection had been limited to barristers understanding Welsh, were there not other gentlemen still more eligible than Mr. Homersham Cox? Besides being an eminent mathematician, he is an able writer on constitutional history and representative governments, yet, as a member of the equity bar, he was very little known in the equity courts, and as a county court judge he will hardly be called on to administer constitutional history or vindicate the social status of villeins. But he is credited with having been an industrious writer in a daily paper which devotes itself much to Mr. Gladstone, and also with having suggested to the Premier the "Royal Warrant" artifice of last session. These are qualifications which might entitle him to the personal gratitude of the Premier, but did not entitle the Premier to require the Chancellor to make him a county court judge.

IT IS SATISFACTORY to learn from the report, which we publish in another column, of the Lord Chancellor's reply to a Manchester deputation, that Mr. J. A. Russell is not to be removed from the Manchester County Court, and that that important court is not to be left to the casual visits of a neighbouring judge. Whether the temporary arrangement by which a county court judge is to be saved pending legislation founded upon the promised report of the Judicature Commission, will work efficiently or not, only exact local knowledge can enable any one to judge. It seems but too clear from the same report that the London Bankruptcy Court is to be left for an indefinite time in its present lamentable and ridiculous condition.

EXECUTORS AND THEIR SOLICITORS must take caution by the case of *Wood* v. *Weightman*, decided in the Rolls Court on Tuesday, upon the practice as to executors' advertisements under Lord St. Leonard's Act. The bill was filed against executors of a deceased trustee for recoupment of an alleged breach of trust, and the executors contended that having no notice of

the claim at the time of distribution, and having complied with the requirements of the Act as to advertisements, they were under no personal liability. It appeared, however, that they had not advertised in the *London Gazette*, but only in local papers, and allowing three weeks only for creditors to come in. On this the Master of the Rolls said that as the Act required the executor to give "such or the like notices" as would have been given in an administration suit, the executors here had not fulfilled those requirements; the Court invariably requiring insertion in the *London Gazette*, and almost always in the *Times*, as well as some other local paper. Moreover, three weeks was too short a time for claim. A case of *Clegg* v. *Rowland* (15 W. R. 530, L. R. 3 Eq. 370) was referred to, but scarcely decides anything. Three weeks was certainly too little.

THE ANNUAL DINNER of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, at which Lord Cairns has promised to take the chair, has been fixed for Thursday, the 13th of June, at Willis's Rooms. The annual report, just issued, gives an excellent account of the good work carried on by this admirable society. It appears that the entire number of members enrolled was, in October last, 2,182, of whom 756 are life members, and 1,426 annual members. The directors were empowered at the last April general meeting to distribute, if necessary, the income from annual subscriptions. As there are more than 10,000 practising solicitors in England and Wales, we hope the proportion of members will increase.

THE REGISTRATION OF BOROUGH VOTERS BILL.

When we noticed this bill, together with others, a short time ago, we pointed out that it was considerably improved since its first appearance last year, but would require careful criticism and amendment before it was passed. We propose now to criticise it, in hopes that this may assist those with whom rests the duty of seeing to the amendment.

We will first consider the principal alterations effected by the bill, and subsequently the details by which these alterations are carried out.

In the first place, the date of qualification is thrown back from the 31st of July to the 24th of June. This is clearly an improvement. The period of occupation, etc., required for a qualification is still twelve months, and not ten months only, as proposed last year.

The next matter is the form of the register. The names are not to be printed alphabetically as now, but according to streets. There are undoubted advantages in this plan, but probably some disadvantages as well. It is scarcely necessary for us to point these out in detail, but on the whole we rather approve of the proposal. It is obvious, however, that in many boroughs which contain large, irregularly-built districts, it will be far from easy, even if possible, to carry it out. Where the borough consists of regular streets it will be easy enough. The bill also contains some provisions as to the register being conclusive. It is probable that any enactment on this head that may be passed this session will be contained in the Ballot Bill, and not in this bill. We may say, however, that the provisions of the bill on this point are extremely badly drawn (a new word, the "title" to vote, being introduced), so that it is quite impossible to make out whether or not personal disqualifications arising after the date of qualification are meant to have any or, if any, what effect.

The scheme of the bill mainly depends upon the appointment of a registrar who is to be responsible for the registration. The expediency of this is a matter of opinion about which we have not much to say. In many places it is not required, the work being efficiently done by a vestry clerk, but in many of these cases the vestry clerk is likely to be appointed registrar. In many places, however, the work is not very well done, and in others, the work is well done in some parishes and not in others. It will, no doubt, be convenient to have one officer to do the work rather than several. The provisions as to the appointment of registrars in particular cases are rather elaborate. The power is in many cases vested in a town council, in others in local boards, but these bodies are in no case bound to appoint registrars, and wherever they do not do so, or there is no body having power to do so, the clerk to the assessment committee of the union is to be registrar. In cases where this would give more than one registrar for the borough, the local government board have power to appoint one of the clerks to be registrar for the whole. The remuneration of the registrar is to be fixed by the authority appointing him, and is to be paid by the various parishes or parts of parishes in proportion to the rateable value of the whole parish. A verbal amendment, if nothing more, is required here in the bill as drawn, for parts of parishes would pay according to the rateable value of the whole, which cannot be meant. It is questionable, however, whether the rateable value of parishes in boroughs is a good test at all. Hitherto, the registration expenses of the town clerk have been apportioned according to the number of voters on the register for each parish. According to the present proposal, parishes probably will not bear the burden so nearly in proportion to the amount of work which they give, as they would if the apportiontment were made in the same way as in the case of the town clerk. There are, however, advantages in having a test less liable to be varied by accidental circumstances than the number of electors for each parish.

The duties of the registrar as to the making out of lists are to be as follows:—A list to be called the borough list (though the name provisional list would seem more appropriate) is to be published on the 15th of July. This list is to include the lodgers of the previous year who still retain the same qualifications, and also such of the lodgers who have sent in claims before the 1st of July, as appear to the registrar upon investigation to be qualified. Claims other than lodger claims are to be made before the 25th of July, and a list of them is to be published on the 1st of August. This list is to include, without further claim, such lodgers as have claimed before the 1st of July, but as to whose qualifications the registrar has not been sufficiently satisfied to include them in the borough list. It does not appear whether a lodger who had omitted to claim by the 1st of July might claim afterwards and before the 25th, and, upon doing so, be entitled to go into the list of claims. Objections to the borough list are to be made before the 31st of July, and to the claim list before the 10th of August, but no list of objections is to be published. The registrar may, however, himself give a notice of objection as late as the 25th of August. The registrar during all this time is to be making inquiries as to the accuracy of his list, and is to investigate all claims and objections, and on the 1st of September is to publish a list called the amendment list. This list is to contain all claims and objections and all amendments made by him to the borough list. He is to state whether the vote is in his opinion good or bad in the case of every claim or objection. Any person who has made a claim or objection may object before the 5th of September to the amendment list, but in the absence of any such second objection, the amendments suggested by the amendment list and by the notes of the registrar thereon are to be made on the borough list. The revising barrister is to hold a court between the 14th of September and the 6th of October, and his duty is to be simply to go through the amendment list, hear and decide upon any objection to it, and to correct the borough list by it.

This scheme is somewhat cumbrous, and in some

respects defective, inasmuch as there are no means of setting matters right if the registrar omits to do any of the things he is required to do, as, for instance, to publish or adjudicate upon any claim or objection. This, however, might be easily provided for, and the scheme might work well enough if it were not for the provisions as to costs which follow. Every person who objects to the amendment list is, before he is heard at all, to pay 2s. 6d. to the registrar for every objection which he originally made, and which the registrar has not decided in his favour. Further, if he ventures to dispute the registrar's decision by objecting to the amendment list, the onus of proving his objection good is thrown upon him. He has no means of securing the attendance of any witnesses or of the person objected to. He must therefore get witnesses to come voluntarily, and to prove the negative as to the persons objected to being not qualified. It is needless to say that in all ordinary cases this would be simply impossible. And if the objector attempts this and fails, he is to pay 5s. at least, and if the revising barrister thinks fit, as much as £2. In no case can the objector get costs.

It is perfectly clear that these fines will render the whole system simply inoperative. No one will think of making any objections at all. The registrar will make out his first list, well or ill, as the case may be, but no one will ever think of interfering or objecting to it. There will be nothing to call the attention of the registrar to any mistakes he may make, and they will pass without correction. Where the registrar happens to be thoroughly efficient, the work may be done about as well as it is now in most places, though rather better than it is now in some. Where, however, the registrar is not efficient, and there is no real security that he will ever be, the work will be done far worse than it is now. Nothing could be a more shortsighted system than this of fining objectors. It is all very well to prevent, as far as possible, voters from being put to expense by frivolous objections, but this is amply provided for by permitting the registrar to defend their interests.

The defect of the present system is that voters objected to have to come or provide some one to appear on their behalf, on peril of having their name struck out simply from default of appearance, and although there is not even a *primâ facie* foundation for the objection. Let the registrar appear for every one objected to, and let the result of inquiries made by him in the course of his duty be *primâ facie* evidence of the facts, and this difficulty is at once obviated. Instead of discouraging objectors, as is done by this Act, every encouragement should be given to them to call the attention of the registrar to questionable votes. The fine for so doing should therefore certainly be removed. If the objector goes on to appeal from the registrar there is much more ground for making him liable to costs, but even then the revising barrister should have some discretion, where he thinks the objection fair and reasonable, although he decides against it. Many questions are so nicely balanced and turn so much upon mere opinion (as, for instance, the value of property admittedly not let at its real value) that revising barristers often decide them in favour of the vote without there being any substantial preponderance of evidence that way. In such a case the objector ought not to be fined.

As regards appeals from revising barristers it would seem to be meant that cases may be stated on questions of fact as well as of law, and that the revising barrister shall have no power to refuse a case if security for costs is given. The Court of Common Pleas, however, are to make rules as to the stating of cases, and the bill is not very definite upon this point. Curiously enough, however, it provides that the order of the Superior Court, as to costs, is to be enforced in the same way as an order of a revising barrister. The framer of the bill does not appear to know that an order of a superior court for costs may be enforced in a manner much simpler than this. In boroughs which are both municipal and parliamentary, the same register is to include both franchises, an additional column being added, so that a particular name may be on for one or the other or for both. The process of registration is to be the same.

Passing now to criticisms of wording or detail, we notice in the second section a clumsy and not very intelligible clause as to the qualification of a person at the date of qualification being conclusive. The meaning of this may be guessed, but it requires to be differently expressed. In the 4th, 5th and 10th sections are some not very consistent provisions as to the case of duplicates. The intention is that a man with several qualifications shall be on only for one, that the registrar shall select which he shall be on for, giving a preference to his residence, that he may himself claim if he likes to be on for any other instead of that selected by the registrar, and that in any case if struck off for one, he may be put on for any other proved to the satisfaction of the barrister. This is just what we have ourselves frequently advocated. The wording of the bill is, however, defective. The 10th section speaks of a person who has been included in a borough list in respect of several qualifications, while the 4th says this shall not be done. Further, the provision on this point in the 5th section will be of little use, because at the time for making such a claim, the person would not know whether he was going to be objected to. In the 4th section, subsection five, hereinafter is printed when hereinbefore is meant. The expression in the 6th section "the inclusion of a person in a list," is not an elegant expression, though intelligible. The 7th section directs the registrar to amend the borough list; the context, however, shows clearly that he is not meant to do this, but merely to suggest the amendments required by inserting them in the amendment list. There is no power to strike out the names of dead persons without serving them with notice of objection. The omission of the present power to do this is probably unintentional. There is no provision as to what is to be done if the registrar omits to insert a claim in the claim or amendment lists, or if he omits to adjudicate on any claim or objection. Rather, we should say, as the bill stands, any objection which the registrar omitted from the amendment list would be lost. What is to become of the lodgers with whose qualification the registrar does not declare himself satisfied—is left very much in the dark. By the repeal of various sections of the present Acts, and the institution of others, various alterations are effected as to the powers and duties of revising barristers in boroughs which are probably unintentional. Thus the barrister must initial and sign the lists, but need not do so in open court as now, although he must read out in open court the alterations made by him in the borough list, but not the alterations made by the registrar. Parties will be entitled to appear by counsel before the revising barrister. The barrister probably will have power to administer an oath (though the express provision at present enabling him to do so is repealed), but the parties swearing falsely will not be guilty of perjury as now, but are simply, under the 30th section, to be guilty of "a misdemeanour." No punishment is provided for this misdemeanour, and therefore it would be punishable by fine and imprisonment simply, but not with hard labour. Why a person swearing falsely before a revising barrister should be guilty of perjury if it is in a county revision, but not if it is in a borough revision, is hard to see. The 14th section provides that the Act shall not affect the revision in counties, except that the provisions as to stating cases are to apply in any case in which, but for the Act, an appeal might be allowed. The effect apparently is that in counties there-

vising barrister must state an appeal on a question of law, and is not to have the discretion in the matter which he has now, but may not state a case on a question of fact, although he may do so in boroughs.

The 19th section ought to give the same power of inspection of rates, lists, etc., to claimants, as to persons whose names have been included in the borough list. In the 23rd section there is a curious expression about a notice containing postage. The 34th section as to registrars in the metropolis is wholly unintelligible. Some words appear to have been left out in the printing of sub-section 1. We conjecture that the words omitted are "instead of," or something to that effect. As it stands, however, it is simply hopeless, and if the bill were to pass as it is, all the metropolitan boroughs would be left without registrars. The concluding paragraph of section 37 gives the revising barrister and registrar a sweeping power over the rights of absent persons, which probably may not be abused, but which seems startling. Section 38 provides that where anything is by the Act limited to be done in a certain number of days and the last of the days is a Sunday, etc., such day shall not be reckoned in the computation. It happens, however, that there is not a single instance in the bill of anything being required to be done in a certain number of days. In every case the form is "on or before a certain named day." The section, therefore, will be inoperative, and the case of these named days falling on a Sunday, which was meant to be provided for, will be found not to be. The schedule contains forms, the more important of which are filled up by entries, intended apparently as examples. Curiously enough, in the amendment list a registrar is supposed to believe that a freeman is qualified in respect of property. This amendment, supposed to have been made by the registrar in the case of William Robinson, is clearly not entered in accordance with the provisions of the bill. Examples are very useful, but they should be accurate, or they are worse than useless.

WHAT IS "REPUDIATION" OF SHARES?

There is probably no rule of law either more reasonable or more widely known than the rule that a shareholder whose share-contract is voidable for misrepresentation must rescind it before the company falls into liquidation, in order to escape the liability to pay the company's creditors. But what are the acts of "rescission" or "repudiation" (for both terms are used, though they are far from convertible) which the shareholder must do? He can file his bill, or he can give notice of a motion for rectification of the share-register under section 35 of the Companies Act, 1862; of which two proceedings the second is the simplest, while the first will be preferred where the bare rectification of the register does not meet all the party's requirements, as, for instance, where an injunction against calls is wanted. Is the shareholder bound to go the length of instituting one of these proceedings? For instance, if the directors yield to his repudiation at once, is he still bound to go on to the length of bill or motion? Must he put the company to the expense of a defence? Or will such a proceeding on his part be considered so unnecessary that the Court of Chancery would make him pay the costs of it? This is an important question, especially for solicitors, who are so frequently called upon to advise and pilot their clients through the extricating process. It will be useful, therefore, especially since the unsatisfactory decision of the Appeal Court in *Wright's case* (*infra*), if we review the materials for the answer.

It must be remembered that we are speaking only of the misrepresentation cases; but it will be well to clear away *in limine* some little confusion which arises from the citation on this subject of cases decided on other grounds for rescission. A voidable contract is valid till disaffirmed, but a void contract is invalid till affirmed. When a man's name is on a share-register in the "void" category, the question—What must he do to protect himself? is a very different question from that which is our present enquiry. For instance, it is a void contract if the shareholder never did agree to accept any allotment of shares in the company—as when the allotment was made after unreasonable delay, or accompanied by a condition which he had not accepted (see *Hebb's case*, 15 W. R. 574, L. R. 4 Eq. 9; *Baily's case*, 16 W. R. 1093; *Pellatt's case*, 15 W. R. 726, L. R. 2 Ch. 527); and under such circumstances, where there has been no affirmance of membership (as by attending meetings or making payments), there is no onus on him of doing anything more than simply notify his rejection: in such cases, as Wood, V.C., said in *Hebb's case*, "so long as a person has rejected the shares, it is not his business to get his name off the register." It is unnecessary to do more than merely point out the error which must arise from an indiscriminate application of the *dicta* in cases of that class to the misrepresentation cases in which the share contract is merely voidable.*

Taking then the case of a shareholder who has discovered the falsehood of the statements which induced him to subscribe to a concern that he believes to be tottering—To what length of action must he go in order to assure his escape? The authorities are by no means clear on the point.

In *Re Cleveland Iron Company, Stephenson's case* (16 W. R. 95), the shareholder had filed no bill, but having been sued by the company at common law for calls, he had defended the action successfully by pleading misrepresentation. His name being on the register when the company went into liquidation, the official liquidator took out a summons to settle him on the list of contributories. Lord Justice Rolt held that he must be so settled, not considering the successful plea to the action as a sufficient repudiatory "proceeding" on his part.

It is clear that *primâ facie* directors have no power of cancelling allotments of shares, *ab initio*, and if any judicial *dictum* to that effect be necessary, it will be found in *Martin's case* (*infra*), and *Wright's case* (20 W. R. 45, L. R. 7 Ch. 55); but is that necessarily inconsistent with their possessing the power of compromising a well-founded repudiation claim by conceding the demand without going the length of a defence which must be unsuccessful?

In *Pawle's case* (17 W. R. 599, L. R. 4 Ch. 497) one Ross, a shareholder in the Estates Investment Company, had filed a bill to repudiate his shares on the ground of misrepresentation in the prospectus, and nine other shareholders, of whom Pawle was one, entered into an arrangement with the directors, through their solicitors, that, with a view to Ross's case being treated as a representative one, they were not to be prejudiced by their not taking separate proceedings of their own. Ross's bill succeeded, but the company went into liquidation; Pawle having taken no further proceedings for removing his name from the register, the official liquidator took out a summons to settle him on the list of contributories. But the Lords Justices (Selwyn and Giffard), affirming the Master of the Rolls, decided, without calling on

* In a paper published in this journal about three years ago (13 S. J. 261, 285), we classified repudiation cases as follows:—(1) Misrepresentation cases, in which the party's contention is, "I did agree to become a member of this company, but my agreement was obtained by fraud;" (2) "Variation" cases, in which the party says, "I did agree to become a member of a company, but it was a company different from this company;" (3) Cases such as those mentioned above, in which the party says, "I did not agree to anything at all;" the first being the case of a voidable, and the second and third of a void, contract. Viewing the "variation" cases as cases in which the contract is void, it seems, in theory, that the party in such a case should be able to repudiate as against creditors after the liquidation has begun; but there is no decision to that effect, though *Wilkinson's case* (15 W. R. 499, L. R. 2 Ch. 536) points in that direction. But at any rate, he must repudiate quickly, or he will be fixed with notice of the contents of the articles of the association, and so with an affirmance of the void contract.

Pawle's counsel, that there was no pretence for contending that Pawle had not done enough in assertion of his repudiation. They said it would be contrary to all the principles of the Court to hold that there was any necessity for separate proceedings by all these nine shareholders, or for any such vexatious accumulation of costs. They said it would have been "improper and vexatious" of Ross had he filed a separate bill. There was another shareholder, named Ashley, who did not, as Pawle and his eight comrades had done, identify himself with Ross's case; he took no proceedings to have his name struck off the register, and he did not inform the company that he claimed the benefit of the decision in *Pawle's case*. Ashley, of course, was settled on the list of contributories (*Ashley's case*, 18 W. R. 395, L. R. 9 Eq. 263). But in this case of the Estates Investment Company a decision of the Court had been given upon an identical question; what must the shareholder do when there is no such precedent? for instance, would Ross, if the directors of the Estates Investment Company had declined to fight his claim, have been bound in his own interest to bring it to a hearing before the Court?

In *Martin's case* (2 H. & M. 672), after a decision removing a name *in consimili casu*, the directors sent round a circular informing all shareholders, whose cases corresponded, that their names had been struck off. In spite of this, Martin pushed his motion to a hearing, but Vice-Chancellor Wood considered his proceeding prudent as well as justifiable—and said that the directors' voluntary act would not have bound the creditors. It is difficult to reconcile this decision with *Pawle's case* (*sup.*)

In *Wright's case* (19 W. R. 947, L. R. 12 Eq. 351), Vice-Chancellor Wickens said:—

"If the shareholder elects in due time and in proper form to avoid the contract, it is avoided altogether, and the case stands as if it had never been made. The question then arises whether, if a shareholder, having a case which entitles him to be discharged on bill filed, applies to the directors, and they, being satisfied of his title, admit, and to the utmost of their power give effect to, his claim to be discharged, that is tantamount for the present purpose to a decree obtained adversely against them for the removal of his name from the register, or to the filing of a bill which results in such a decree. *It is of course essential, in the case supposed, that the shareholder's right to discharge should be established independently altogether of the director's admission;* and should be exercised in such a way as to destroy all future claim on his part to be a shareholder in respect of the shares in question. But if these conditions are fulfilled, it is difficult to see, on principle, why the filing of a bill should make any difference.

"It cannot be necessary for the directors to maintain a hopeless defence to a well-grounded claim, and the submission to an immediate decree after a bill filed can hardly be more efficacious than a submission to the same relief after the bill is prepared, but before it is filed; or after it is threatened, but before it is prepared; or after the claim is formally made, but before the bill is threatened in terms. The matter, however, does not rest on principle merely. For *Pawle's case* seems to determine that an agreement by the directors to abide by the determination of a suit by one shareholder as governing the case of another is as effectual for the exoneration of the latter as if he had filed a bill of his own. This seems necessarily to involve that if the suit actually instituted had been determined before the winding-up, the directors might have acted on the decision by cancelling the shares *ab initio*."

The italics in the above extract are our own. The meaning of the italicised sentence is not quite clear. How must the shareholder's right be "established" independently of the directors' admission? Is it necessary that there should be a decision of the Court *in pari materiâ*? Or does the Vice-Chancellor only mean that the shareholder's right must be a good right on its merits, so as to be capable of being confirmed or "established" by the Court in the event of an official liquidator subsequently applying to have his name replaced on the register?

There is no decision throwing any further light on the subject, for, as we shall presently notice, the judgment given by the Lord Chancellor, on the appeal from Vice-Chancellor Wickens, is not likely to avail much for guidance. In this state of uncertainty, it seems to us that unless there be some decision *in consimili casu* upon which the directors can base their voluntary admission, the shareholder will be best advised to bring his case before the Court, and will be entitled to his costs of so doing.

Wright's case was appealed, but there is nothing in the appeal decision which takes away the authority of the passage above cited. We must, however, notice the point involved in the appeal, it being one of considerable importance, as well as a singular one. The facts were these. When Wright's name was removed from the register by the directors he had not made any claim on ground of misrepresentation; the Stock Exchange had refused a settling-day to the company, and on that ground Wright requested the directors to return his money. The directors returned his money, and struck him off the register; and the Lords Justices (L. R. 12 Eq. 335, *in notâ*) held that this was properly done, because the directors, though not empowered either by the general law or the constitution of the company to cancel allotments, had under the articles an express power to accept surrenders of shares. Wright was not at this time aware, though the directors, of course, were, that there was an untruth in the statements of the prospectus, which entitled him to rescind his share-contract on that ground. The company went into liquidation very shortly after the above transaction, and the official liquidator applied to make him a B contributory as having been a shareholder within the year. Vice-Chancellor Wickens settled him on the B list, on the ground that the transaction was nothing more than a surrender of or retirement from his shares as from the date of the negotiation and not *ab initio*; it lay, he said, upon Wright to show that "a concluded election to have his allotment cancelled on the ground of misrepresentation" was made before the commencement of the winding-up. This seems a sound principle, and it is unfortunate that it has been reversed by a decision in which the facts of the case seem imperfectly realised. In his appeal judgment Lord Hatherley says that if before the winding-up Wright had discovered his "higher right" (the right grounded on the misrepresentation) it would not have been necessary for him to file a bill to put that right in force—

"I will take Mr. Wright to have made a demand on the honour and fair dealing of the directors, as making it incumbent on them to return him his money, he not knowing how much higher he could put his case, and they being perfectly conscious of the fraud they had committed in the representations they had made. Thereupon they at once gave him all the relief which, had he been informed of the facts, he could have demanded as a matter of right."

The concluding words contain the vice in the judgment; it is a gratuitous assumption on Lord Hatherley's part that the directors had by cancelling his shares given him all the relief he could have claimed on the ground of misrepresentation; the Lords Justices only decided that the directors had accepted a *surrender* of his shares; and Wright, not discovering the misrepresentation before the winding-up, never demanded more, so that there was not even a "voluntary admission" by the directors of his right to rescind *ab initio*.

Under these circumstances, the appeal decision can hardly be accepted as a guide for future practice. It does indeed amount to a direct decision that a shareholder who has surrendered his shares is not bound, if he afterwards discovers misrepresentation, to go to the court to cancel his allotment *ab initio*. But it proceeds, as we have just pointed out, upon so erroneous an estimate of the facts in the case that the practitioner should be warned against placing reliance on it.

COURTS.

COUNTY COURTS.

EXETER.

Before Serjeant PETERSDORFF, Judge.

(March 5.—*Re Parish, ex parte Badcock*).

Bankruptcy—Deed of attornment.

A tenant of a house at rack-rent, being indebted to a creditor, executed a deed by which he purported (1) *to mortgage to the creditor all his interest in the house,* (2) *to become tenant to the creditor at a rent stated. The creditor having distrained under this deed, and the trustee under the the tenant's bankruptcy having obtained an interim injunction against the distress,*

The Court refused to make the injunction perpetual; on the ground that the deed was not void, either under 13 *Eliz., or under the Bankruptcy Act,* 1869, *or as a Bill of Sale.*

In the bankruptcy of John Parish, of the Dolphin Inn Exeter, Mr. Serjeant Petersdorff gave judgment on an application by the trustee in the liquidation proceedings that the Court should make perpetual an interim order restraining proceedings under a distress levied by Messrs. Badcock, under a deed of attornment. The matter was argued some months ago, it being contended by the trustee that the deed was void as against him. The facts appear in the judgment.

Budd for the trustee.

Mr. Sparkes, solicitor, of Crediton, for Messrs. Badcock.

Cur. adv. vult.

SERJEANT PETERSDORFF now gave judgment.—The petition was filed on the 28th of October, 1871, and a trustee was duly appointed. Possession was taken of the debtor's effects on the 30th, and later on the same day a distress was levied for £173 5s. 8d., under a deed of attornment, in which John Vowles was trustee for certain individuals whose names were entered in it. That was the deed which it was sought to set aside. It was of somewhat a novel character, both as regarded its form and objects, and the terms in which it was expressed, although he was aware that recently these documents had been frequently drawn. The deed really transformed the relative position of debtor and creditor into the character of mortgagor and mortgagee; and no sooner was this done than another transformation took place, and the position of landlord and tenant was created. The deed stated that Parish was indebted to Messrs. Badcock in certain sums of money, and that they required him to give security for the monies due to them; and he (Parish) thereby surrendered and assigned to John Vowles his interest in the Dolphin Inn, then in the possession of Parish, for his present and any future term which he might have or acquire in the said premises. On the payment of the several sums enumerated in the deed the mortgage was to cease, and the relation of landlord and tenant be terminated. The deed then went on to reserve a rent of £500, payable in advance, with full power to enter and a right to distrain on a declaration of attornment—the effect of which was to establish an immediate tenancy on the part of Parish.

[Mr. Sparkes said there was no express power of distress contained in the deed.]

SERJEANT PETERSDORFF said there was a right of entry, and the relations of landlord and tenant existing created a right of distraint. The question raised in the case was one of the highest importance, for the point would doubtless continually occur. The primary question was whether there was anything on the face of the deed which would make it illegal? It would be extremely difficult to say that the deed in itself was invalid; and if it was to be impeached it could only be successfully assailed by evidence of fraud not manifest on the face of the document itself. The parties opposing the deed suggested three distinct propositions—first, that the deed was fraudulent and void under the 13th Elizabeth, as prejudicial to creditors and intended to defeat them; secondly, that it was invalid under the Bankruptcy Act of 1869; and thirdly, that it was void because it was a bill of sale within the terms of the Bills of Sale Act, and that the requirements of that statute had not been complied with.

With respect to the first point, it was useless to say that the deed had a tendency to defeat or delay creditors; it must be shown that it had necessarily and in fact that operation. The words of the Act were clear and unambiguous. The first clause specified what deeds should be declared void, but the sixth section contained a proviso that the previous clause should not extend to any transfer or conveyance of goods and chattels for a good consideration lawfully effected and shown. There was nothing on the face of the deed which would enable anybody to say that it sought to accomplish any fraudulent, sinister, or any undisclosed purpose; the ends and objects of it were clearly stated on the face of the deed itself. The enactments of the statute of Elizabeth were not co-extensive with the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act; and a deed which might be fraudulent and void under the latter Act would not be void under the statute of Elizabeth. In this case there was no question raised that the debt which the mortgagees claimed was a valid debt, which they were entitled to enforce; and not only was there the consideration of a past debt, but it was stated in the deed that one of the inducements for the execution of the deed was the prospect held out of an extension of credit, which, although not obligatory, would, if granted, probably prove more beneficial than prejudicial to creditors. The deed was simply a conveyance of the interest which the debtor had in the Dolphin—an interest which was of no intrinsic value, as the debtor held it at a rack-rent, and there was no conveyance or transfer of any property of any kind or description from the debtor to the mortgagees. The debtor, after the execution of this deed, had the same power—the same control over whatever property there was as if the deed had never existed; and he was in no way impeded in carrying on his trade, or prevented from exercising his right to remove goods from his premises, or selling or handing them to any creditors, had he been so disposed. A power of distress was widely different from a transfer of property; and the deed conveyed no power beyond that of taking property co-extensive with the amount of the claim for rent. The power which was given might or might not be fraudulently exercised; but in this case there was no evidence of any fraud. Nothing had been parted with—nothing changed on the execution of the deed; and he therefore held that under the powers of the statute of Elizabeth, it could not be successfully assailed.

There then remained the two other points to be considered. It had been held in a recent case that where a party made an assignment of the whole of his effects it was to be taken as a matter of law that it would prejudicially affect the interests of his creditors; but in this case the deed did not convey the whole of the property of the debtor—did not in fact convey any portion of his property; and therefore it did not come within the clauses of the Bankruptcy Act.

As to the Bills of Sale Act, an instrument of this kind did not come within the terms of that Act, and the non-compliance with the requirements of that statute did not interfere with the legal operation.

He therefore dismissed the application for making the interim order perpetual, but should make no order as to costs.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. THOMAS HOLLOWAY SLANN, solicitor, of Holt, in the county of Norfolk (firm, Wilkinson & Slann), has been appointed (by W. H. Cooke, Esq., Q.C., Judge of the Norfolk County Courts) to be Registrar of the Attleborough County Court, which office had been rendered vacant by the death of Mr. J. C. Calver, solicitor. Mr. Slann was admitted in 1857, and has for some years acted as deputy registrar of the Holt County Court. Though retaining his professional connection with Holt, Mr. Slann, in consequence of his appointment to the registrarship, will now reside at Attleborough.

Mr. CHARLES MILLS, solicitor, of Huddersfield, has been appointed Clerk to the magistrates of that borough, in succession to Mr J. C. Laycock, who has resigned after holding the office for forty-three years. Mr. Mills was certificated in 1859, and has been for some years secretary to the Huddersfield Chamber of Commerce. He has recently been appointed solicitor to the local School Board, and also a commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women.

Mr. HENRY DIXON, solicitor, of Sunderland, has been appointed Clerk to the magistrates of that borough, in succession to the late Mr. Cooper Abbis. Mr. Dixon was certificated in 1832, and had been a member of the Sunder-

land Town Council, in which he represented Bridge Ward: but resigned his seat a few days previous to his appointment, in order to render himself eligible for the office of magistrates' clerk.

Messrs. Hull, Stone & Fletcher, solicitors, of Liverpool, have been appointed solicitors to the Liverpool School Board, upon the usual terms of attorney and client, as in the case of Mr. Fisher, the former solicitor.

Mr. Samuel Hadfield, of Manchester, in the county of Lancaster, and of Bowdon, in the county of Chester, solicitor, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women in and for the county of Chester, as well as in and for the county of Lancaster.

Mr. Stonhewer Parker Freeman, of the firm of Bothamleys & Freeman, 39, Coleman-street, has been appointed a perpetual commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

*** L. & M.—We intend to comment on the case, when reported, in a "Recent Decision."

Bills and Notes under £1.

Sir,—Can you, or any of your readers, inform me what is the real state of the law as to bills of exchange and promissory notes for sums under 20s.? *My reading* had produced the impression that all such bills were void, and that utterers and negotiators of them were liable to a penalty of from £5 to £20; but *my experience* teaches me that bills under 20s. are as negotiable as any others.

Mr. Byles is very unsatisfactory in his dictum, for (p. 83) he says: "By the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 105, the 17 Geo. 3, c. 30, is repealed *in toto*, and *so much of any other Act as prohibits or imposes any penalty with respect to bills or notes under* £5, except promissory notes payable to bearer on demand." The italics are mine.

The simple question is, whether Mr. Byles is right or wrong. A Law Student.

Gresham-street, March 9.

Stafford *v.* Gardiner, 20 W. R. 299.

Sir,—This case is very important, and should be well known. Can you or any of your readers refer me to any decision or authority for the following case?

A. lets a farm to B. under a written agreement which clearly defined the rights of both parties; the tenancy was determined at Lady-day, 1871, by notice to quit; previously to Lady-day A. lets the farm to C.; the rent was reserved half-yearly, and all rent due from B. to the previous 29th of September had been paid. The usual valuations were made and agreed to between B. and C., and about three weeks before Lady-day, 1871, C. paid the amount of them to B., who absconded to America, leaving the half year's rent due at Lady-day unpaid. A. demands the rent of C., alleging that he had no right to pay B without previously ascertaining if the rent was paid, and *under a threat of distress*, aided also, no doubt, by the pressure which a landlord can put upon a new tenant. C. paid the half-year's rent left unpaid by B.

Consulted by C. as to his liability to pay this rent, which was paid under threat of distress, I am unable to find any authority justifying A. There is no pretence for collusion between B. and C., B.'s absconding taking every one by surprise. A Constant Reader and Subscriber.

March 14, 1871.

Mr. E. T. E. Besley has withdrawn his candidature for the City coronership, and Mr. J. J. Merriman, solicitor, has become a candidate.

Mr. Isaac Preston, jun., solicitor, of Great Yarmouth, has been appointed clerk to the visiting justices of the Yarmouth Gaol.

It is stated that Mr. John S. T. Greene, County Court Judge of the Districts of Bolton, Bury, Wigan, and Leigh, resigns his appointment. Mr. Greene, who is between sixty and seventy years of age, has held the office since March, 1847. It is also rumoured that he will be succeeded by Mr. Thomas Perronet Edward Thompson, of the Northern Circuit, Recorder of Scarborough.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

March 14.—*Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries Bill.*—Report of Amendments.—Lord Salisbury criticised the "commercial aspects" of the bill, under which the salaries of the officers of the new court—chancellors, bishops' secretaries, &c.—would be paid out of fees for visitations, ordinations, consecrations, and other ceremonials. These fees must soon be abolished, and so the salaries would be thrown upon the State.—Lord Shaftesbury said the same objections and risk applied to the present system. The fees would be applied to the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts, which would be welcomed by the clergy generally.—The Bishop of London thought that the bill ought to provide for the mode of procedure in the courts proposed to be established.—Lord Cairns regretted the rejection of the Ecclesiastical Procedure Bill, though it might have been amended by giving the right of prosecuting the clergy for offences other than of doctrine to three inhabitants of the parish instead of the diocese. He agreed that the present bill was based upon an unsound system of finance.—The Archbishop of Canterbury explained that under the plan proposed by this bill the fees would be more easily collected (by means of stamps), more equitably distributed, and more willingly paid. These fees stood upon a sufficiently stable basis to justify the passing of the bill.—The report was then received, and the amendments were discussed *seriatim* upon the clauses relating to the preservation of ecclesiastical records.—Lord Romilly strongly urged the passing of clause 68, enacting that bishops' registers older than fifty years should be transferred to the Record Office, London. In only three or four dioceses were they kept in a proper state of preservation. Documents of great value were rotting in garrets and cellars, while in the Record Office they would be carefully preserved, catalogued and indexed.—The Lord Chancellor agreed that something ought to be done, but could not approve the clause. The clause was then negatived, Lord Romilly saying he would revive the matter on the third reading.—On clause 69 parochial registers upwards of twenty years old could be transferred to the Record Office.—The Duke of Richmond said it would be a hardship to the parishioners to be obliged to come to London to obtain copies of these registers instead of getting them from the clergyman of the parish. He had had communications from the clergy in all parts of the country, disapproving of this proposal.—Lord Romilly pointed out not only that these documents were decaying from the want of suitable places to keep them in, but that the judges were cognisant of falsifications and mutilations now of almost daily occurrence where the title to property was concerned.—The clause, however, was struck out.—Clause 117 (repeals, with certain exceptions, the Church Discipline Act).—Lord Salisbury having moved that the clause be struck out, Lord Shaftesbury said he was so satisfied as to the right of every layman to take proceedings in the common law courts, that he cared little about the retention of the clause.—Lord Cairns said that any one who supposed the rights of laymen to bring actions for infringement of the Act of Uniformity could be practically enforced in the courts of common law would be very much mistaken.—The clause was eventually struck out, and the bill ordered to be read a third time on Thursday the 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

March 8.—*Welsh County Court Judges.*—On the motion for going into Committee of Supply, Mr. Osborne Morgan moved "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the judge of a county court district in which the Welsh language is generally spoken, should be able to speak and understand that language." He had no desire to claim for his own countrymen any special privilege whatever, Welshmen were not advocates of Home Rule in the sense in which that phrase was used on the other side of the Channel, or, indeed, in any sense whatever. They claimed for themselves no right whatever, except that which he had always understood to be the birthright of every subject of the kingdom, whether Englishman or Welshman, Scotchman or Irishman—to have justice dealt out to them as far as circumstances would permit. The county of Montgomery was the most exclusively Welsh part of Wales. In that district at least four-fifths of the population habitually spoke

Welsh. They carried on the ordinary intercourse of life, concluded bargains, wrote letters, and made their wills in that language. After telling several comic stories of miscarriages of justice through an interpreter, he proceeded to argue the necessity of a Welsh county court judge understanding Welsh. Lord Lyndhurst made it a *sine quâ non*. All he asked was that the Lord Chancellor should follow the example set by one of his predecessors. There was no man at the bar more competent to discharge the duties of a county court judge than Mr. Tindal Atkinson, but he did not speak Welsh. Whether from that cause or not he did not know, but Mr. Atkinson wished to be removed, and Mr. Homersham Cox was appointed in his place. He did not wish to speak with any disrespect of Mr. Homersham Cox. That gentleman had written works on the differential calculus and on the British Constitution, and, besides, was a very powerful political writer for the press, whose services, he believed, and he did not use the word invidiously, were placed at the disposal of the Government. But Mr. Homersham Cox was certainly not a man of large practice. He had the honour of practising in the same courts with Mr. Homersham Cox for 10 or 12 years, and he had never seen him hold a brief. If the Lord Chancellor had said he could not get a good man who could speak Welsh this motion would never have been brought forward, but no such reason was given. He himself certainly knew at least half-a-dozen gentlemen at the Bar who could speak Welsh fluently, some of whom would be admirable county court judges, and, taken by the test of practice, far superior to Mr. Homersham Cox. The reasons given by the Lord Chancellor for the appointment were threefold. The first was that in the case of suits between an Englishman and a Welshman a judge selected for his Welsh acquirements would become an object of distrust to the Englishman. Now, if the Lord Chancellor were asked to appoint a man who could not understand a word of English there might be some ground for the imputation; but surely a Welshman had as good a right to distrust a judge who could not speak a word of Welsh. Besides, Mr. Johns and Mr. Richards, who were chosen for their Welsh acquirements, were never distrusted by any one. Then the Lord Chancellor took his stand on a statute more than 300 years old, which provided that all justices, sheriffs, coroners, and so forth, should proclaim and keep the session in the English tongue, and which forbade the use of Welsh. But if, under that statute, men who spoke Welsh were not eligible, then Mr. Johns and Mr. Richards should not have been made county court judges. But if all that was meant was that the proceedings should be carried on in English, then the judge who knew both languages could carry out the law quite as well as one who knew only English; besides that he would have the inestimable advantage of being able to check the evidence just as Chief Justice Bovill the other day corrected an interpreter who was making a wrong use of a French word. But he could not help thinking that the statute in question was dug up from the rubbish of past centuries, seeing that it had remained for 100 years at least a dead-letter. Another objection made by the Lord Chancellor amounted to this—that it was desirable to get rid of the Welsh language. Now, this was the first time he had ever heard of a Lord Chancellor who, in dispensing judicial patronage, did so, not on the ground of the judicial qualifications of the man appointed, but because his appointment would be likely to encourage or discourage a particular language. As the *Pall Mall Gazette* remarked, the complete extirpation of the Welsh language in 1900, desirable as such a result might be, was not a good which we had a right to purchase at the expense of a failure of justice in 1872. Mr. Homersham Cox, returning from his first circuit flushed with judicial triumphs, wrote to all the London newspapers saying that he had performed the business of the circuit to everybody's satisfaction as well as his own. Unfortunately, there appeared next day in the *Daily News* a letter, alluding to a case tried before Mr. Cox, in which much time had been lost in translating from Welsh into English, and after two hours had been spent the judge said that the case must be tried by a jury. It was said that an influential memorial had been signed in favour of the appointment. Now, solicitors were not quite disinterested witnesses on this subject, because the judge's ignorance of the language drove a considerable amount of business in their hands. But the Welsh solicitors were men of high honour, and though much pressure was brought to bear upon the 90 solicitors on this circuit, only nine of them had signed the memorial. There could hardly be a stronger proof of the feeling in the district. He himself had received many letters on this subject. The question was essentially a suitor's and not a solicitor's question. There did not exist on the face of the earth a more peaceable or loyal people than the inhabitants of South Wales, and all he asked for them was *ex debito justitiæ*.—Mr. Parry seconded the resolution, maintaining that the grievance was a real and not a sentimental one.—Mr. Hanbury-Tracy admitted that it was of great importance that a judge should understand the language of the district in which he administered justice; but if an abstract resolution like the present were passed without affirming the principle that judicial ability, general attainments, and legal experience were of paramount importance, a great mistake would, in his opinion, have been committed. Where two men were equally well qualified for the office of county court judge, the preference ought to be given to the man who could speak the language of the people. He would, however, lay down no rigid rule in the matter, but would leave to the Government the responsibility of choosing the fittest person. On the North and South Wales Circuits, at the Chancery Bar, and on the Northern Circuit, he found there were only seven barristers who spoke Welsh. That was a very small number, and it would, under those circumstances, be inexpedient to fix the area of selection within so narrow a limit. He hoped the Government would agree to the resolution with such modification as the insertion, after "should," of the words "as far as the limits of selection will allow."—Mr. Scourfield understood that Mr. O. Morgan was willing to accept the principle of Mr. Hanbury-Tracy's amendment, and in that case the resolution resolved itself into the most harmless truism. The question was an administrative one, and he did not see what advantage would result from passing an abstract resolution on the subject. No one would say that it was not desirable that county court judges in Wales, otherwise properly qualified, should speak the Welsh language, but he should be sorry to affirm a resolution which might limit the area of selection.—Mr. Richard trusted that the Government would accept the resolution, together with the principle of the amendment.—Mr. Holland dilated on the grievance to suitors. The losing party generally attributed the loss of their case to the fact that it had not been properly explained to the judge. He understood that Mr. Homersham Cox was a man of very respectable attainments; his talents, he believed, were fully recognised where he was intimately known, and he hoped the Home Office would before long take an opportunity of removing him from the position which he now held to some place where he would be more appreciated.—Mr. M'Arthur supported the motion.—Mr. Watkin Williams also supported the motion. Sufficient importance was not attributed to the fact that a county court judge had chiefly to deal with small cases, and if the judge were not acquainted with the language of the people it was utterly impossible that justice could be done. Had it been believed or even asserted that the Lord Chancellor in appointing this particular judge had made an effort to secure a man possessing these qualifications this motion would never have been brought forward; but Mr. Homersham Cox had never been heard of until he was made a county court judge in Wales, and, therefore, it could not be supposed that he had had such legal experience as qualified him to fill that post. Possibly it might be true that the present Lord Chancellor was not to blame in the matter, but it was a great shame that an appointment to an important office like that of a county court judge, who had to act as both judge and jury, should be made on any other considerations than the fitness of the person appointed to hold the office.—Mr. O. Stanley supported the motion.—Mr. Bruce said that when it was remembered, however, that the present system had been in force for upwards of 350 years, it was wonderful that complaints with reference to its operation and to the anomalies it involved had not been more frequently made. The English system of law was first applied to Wales in the reign of Henry VIII., and the effect produced upon the minds of a people speaking Welsh exclusively by justice being administered by English speaking judges and barristers must have been extraordinary. In process of time the worst features of the case had undoubtedly been ameliorated, but even at the present moment anomalies still existed which were startling. Thus in many parts of Wales it was impossible to call together a jury who could understand all that was ad-

dressed to them by the judge. How justice had been administered under these circumstances it was impossible to say, but perhaps generally there were one or two men on the jury who understood English, and were enabled to explain what occurred to them, although doubtless in an imperfect way. The case of a county court judge was undoubtedly very different from that of a judge at assizes or quarter sessions. The Government, in making the appointment in the present case, had acted upon the general practice that had been followed for a long time past—of looking rather to the legal attainments of the person appointed than to his knowledge of the Welsh language. It was only thirty-five years ago that any Act was passed requiring that all clergymen appointed to a Welsh living should speak Welsh, and he should think that, a proper regard being had to legal attainments, a similar provision with regard to Welsh county court judges would not be out of place. In appointing a gentleman who, though not acquainted with Welsh, would do honour to any appointment, the Lord Chancellor acted as most of his predecessors would have done. The Lord Chancellor had authorised him to say that he admitted the force of much which had been urged. Legal fitness would, of course, be always the first consideration; but after the representations which had been made by hon. members connected with Wales, the Government, as also he was sure all future Governments, would make the knowledge of Welsh a consideration. He believed that at no time since the conquest of Wales by Edward I. had there been more Welsh-speaking people than at present. It was hardly 100 years since the Cornish tongue had died out, and in the time of William Rufus the population of Exeter was so equally balanced that service in the Cathedral was directed to be performed alternately in Welsh and English. It was a mistake to suppose that the life of the Welsh language would be prolonged by insisting on county court judges understanding it. The only effect of it would be to implant in the minds of the people a feeling that they were treated with a degree of justice and consideration which he was bound to say they had not hitherto received. The Government were willing to accept the motion with the amendment.—The resolution was then withdrawn.

March 13.—*Fires Bill.*—Mr. M'Lagan moved the second reading of his Fires Bill, founded on the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1867. It provides that every fire, about the origin of which there is a reasonable suspicion, shall be reported by the police to the coroner; and that the coroner for each district shall hold an inquiry on receiving such a report, or when he is directed by a Secretary of State, or when application is made to him by persons who have suffered by the fire. The Home Secretary is empowered to appoint an assessor to sit with the coroner, and local authorities may appoint a special officer for the purpose. The expenses are to be paid from the rates, and pending the inquiries fire insurance companies are forbidden to pay any claims.

Mr. Agar-Ellis, Mr. Turner, Sir H. Selwin Ibbetson, Mr. Dalrymple, and Mr. Macfie, supported the bill, Mr. Read also supported it, but objected to the costs being laid on the county rates, and suggested that the insurance companies should contribute.—Mr. Kinnaird, speaking for a company with which he had been connected twenty years, said the directors would have no objection, but the companies could not so well follow up an enquiry, and that was the main thing. —Mr. Bruce cordially approved the principle of the bill, and praised the skill with which it was drafted. He doubted however, whether the coroner would always have power and experience to conduct these inquiries. Dr. Brewer said the coroner was not an officer of sufficient legal intelligence and training to undertake such responsibilities as would be thrown upon him by the bill, which was wholly inadequate as far as the proposed tribunal was concerned. He would not, however, oppose the measure. The bill was then read a second time.

Albert and European Assurance Companies (Inquiry) Bill.—Mr. Barnett, in moving the second reading of this bill, said that in the absence of the member for Shoreham (Mr. Cave) whose bill it was, he hoped the House would consent to the motion, and at a subsequent stage allow his right hon. friend to state his case in favour of the measure. The collapse of great companies, whose liabilities amounted to several millions, was calculated to throw discredit on the whole system of life assurances unless matters were properly explained. He had no doubt the result of the inquiry would show that with ordinary prudence in the management of life assurance business such catastrophes could not occur. Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson and Mr. Hermon objected to the clause which provided for the payment of the expenses of the inquiry out of the public Exchequer.—Mr. Chichester Fortescue said there was no doubt that if the sanction of Parliament was given to the proposal that this Commission of Inquiry should be carried on at the expense of the State, a very strong and exceptional case should be made out. But he believed that the case was of a very exceptional character, and he could not help looking with some favour on the proposals of his right hon. friend now absent. The arrangement proposed was a perfectly fair one, and meanwhile members should suspend their judgment upon the question.—The bill was then read a second time, and was fixed for committee on Wednesday, April 10.

Public Worship Facilities Bill.—Mr. Salt moved the second reading of this bill, which empowers bishops to license a clergyman to perform Divine worship in any convenient room in parishes of more than 2,000 inhabitants, and in hamlets of more than 20 houses and more than two miles from a parish church. Due notice was to be given to the incumbent before any licence was granted by the diocesan, and he could appeal to the archbishop.—Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Monk, Mr. Newdegate, and Mr. Wharton, opposed the bill as a revolution of the parochial system.—Mr. Cowper-Temple opposed it as failing to recognise the rights of the laity.—Mr. Whitwell opposed it because it would introduce into parishes elements of dissension.—Mr. Norwood, Sir G. Jenkinson, and Mr. Collins, supported the bill.—Mr. Hardy said the real remedy would be the division of parishes, but this bill would only divide the parishioners.—Mr. Henley supported the bill, as seeing no other way of providing for the spiritual destitution of an increasing population.—Mr. Bruce, on behalf of the Government, assented to the principle of the bill; but it would require alteration in committee.—The second reading was carried by 122 to 93.

Justices' Clerks (Salaries) Bill.—Mr. Magniac, in the absence of the hon. member for Greenwich (Sir D. Salomons) moved the second reading of this bill. Its object was to carry into effect one of the recommendations of the committee which sat in 1850 on which had been founded the permissive clauses of Sir George Grey's Act of 1861 with reference to the payment of judicial officers by salaries instead of fees. The newspapers frequently called attention to what was called justices' justice, where nominal fines only were inflicted and yet the costs amounted to 17s. Every one knew what a dismissed case was. The person charged had offended, but the offence was so small that the judge could not let him off altogether, and therefore he imposed a fine over which he had no control whatever. In agricultural districts a case dismissed with costs meant a fine of 8s. 6d. for, perhaps, a petty inoffensive larceny. Accumulated fees became very hard when for the same offence perhaps three persons were fined. These fees placed the clerks to justices in a very unfair position—as if they had a pecuniary interest in the conviction of the accused. He believed, on the other hand, that justices' clerks performed their duties in a very proper manner, but, at the same time, he had no hesitation in saying that their payment by fees was a wrong which called for a remedy at the hands of the House. From returns it appeared that in seven out of ten counties and in twenty-four boroughs the permissive clauses of Sir George Grey's Act had been adopted, and in no instance had any complaint been made as to the results of the change. The committee which sat in 1850 recommended that all judicial officers should be paid by salary instead of by fees. Justices' clerks were not mentioned by name, but he gathered from remarks made by Sir George Grey, that justices' clerks were intended to be included, and he certainly did not see any ground for their exclusion. The object of the bill, as stated in the preamble, was to provide for the payment of clerks to justices by salaries in lieu of fees, and to regulate the appointment of such clerks. He proposed to eliminate the latter part of the 5th clause and also the 11th. Justices would be required to make a table of fees, to be sanctioned by the Home Department, so that he hoped a uniform table of fees for the whole country would be the result. He had no hesitation in saying that the present table of fees, which varied in every possible way, was a disgrace to the country. He proposed to add a clause after clause 6 enabling justices to remit fees in case of poverty.

He was informed that in some cases it was absolutely necessary that prosecutions should be initiated by clerks to the justices; on the other hand, it was held to be most unsatisfactory that clerks to the justices should have anything whatever to do with promotion. But he did not see any objection to the clerks making copies of the depositions. With regard to the qualification of clerks of the justices, the bill proposed that they should be attorneys-at-law. He hoped the bill would be read a second time, when he proposed that it should be commited *pro forma* to enable him to introduce certain amendments.—Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson seconded the motion. His own and the adjoining county had adopted the permissive powers of the Act passed some years ago, and the object of this measure was to bring about uniformity in the system which had worked well. The magistrates would thereby be relieved of much difficulty when the hardship created by fees was great, and their clerks would be placed above the suspicion which sometimes unjustly attached to them of encouraging business on account of the remuneration attached to it. There were several points in the bill which would require to be carefully considered in committee, but experience satisfied him that it would introduce a salutary change.—Sir M. Beach opposed the bill. If the change it proposed were to be made at all, it ought to be made upon the authority of the Government and not at the instance of private members. He moved the rejection of the bill for several reasons. The statement that confused accounts were kept at present was against rather than in favour of the bill, because the manner in which the accounts were kept was a matter of no importance except to those who received the fees. The bill would open a door to mistakes and possibly to fraud, which could not be committed now because the authorities were in no way interested in the amount of the fees and in the keeping of the accounts relating to them. He doubted very much whether the administration of justice at Petty Sessions would be improved by the proposed change. At present, in the event of a committal, the clerk was paid according to the number of depositions, and he had, therefore, a direct interest in seeing that the case was made out clearly; but if the clerk were paid by fees he would have no such interest, and there would be great risk of his duty being discharged in a perfunctory manner. If prisoners were committed for trial without full depositions being taken, the result might be the failure of prosecutions such as succeeded under the present system. The proposed change was likely to place an additional burden on the county rates. He admitted the individual hardship of such cases as had been put, in which the costs were so exceedingly disproportionate to the penalties imposed; but such cases only proved the necessity for a revision of the existing scale of fees. If the fees were revised as they ought to be, and adapted to the circumstances of these petty cases, there would be no hardship either in imposing or remitting a fee. The arguments of the supporters of the bill implied that there would be a very considerable remission of fees in the future in the case of poor persons or of persons guilty of trivial offences. If the salary of a clerk was fixed upon an average of the last three years, and if fees were remitted in the future, the salary would be in excess of the fees received, and the balance would have to be paid by the ratepayers. This would be a charge of a new description, because the county ratepayers were not legally liable in any way for the salaries of clerks to justices, unless their representatives at Quarter Sessions of their own free will adopted the permissive Act. This bill would make the permissive Act compulsory, and it would impose upon the already overburdened ratepayers a charge for the administration of justice, the cost of which hitherto had not been met out of local rates. If it were preferred to pay clerks by salaries, the magistrates were at liberty to make the change now; but it had been made voluntarily by no more than five counties in England and two in Wales, with the result that in four cases the rates were burdened, and in three the counties were gainers. In one the tender-hearted justices had remitted no less than £500 in fees. More than 150 boroughs in England and Wales still paid their clerks by fees, and only twenty-four paid them by salaries. The proposed change, therefore, was clearly in opposition to public opinion.—Mr. Sclater-Booth would oppose the bill, unless machinery were introduced for relieving the ratepayers in case of deficiency.—Lord Mahon supported the bill.—Mr. Hunt said the question really was whether it was desirable that the legal adviser of the magistrates should have a pecuniary interest in the cases which came before them. He believed it was not, and on that ground he should support the bill, which, however, would require to be amended in details. The payment of fees by stamps under the Local Stamp Act would facilitate its operation. Salaries had been paid for two years in Northamptonshire; the county gained one year and lost the other, and the two years had nearly balanced each other. He had not heard that there had been any lack of attention to their duties on the part of the clerks.—Mr. Winterbotham, reserving what he had to say until the bill got into committee, stated that the Government heartily approved its two objects—compulsory payment by salaries instead of fees, and compulsory revision of the table of fees.—Mr. Pell was speaking against the bill, when the clock pointed to a quarter to six, and the debate, therefore, stood adjourned by the rules of the House.

County courts—Sale of goods under 40*s.*—Mr. Bass introduced a bill to abolish plaints in county courts for debts under 40s. for goods sold and delivered.

Corrupt practices at municipal elections.—Mr. H. James introduced a bill for the better prevention of corrupt practices at municipal elections, and for the establishing of a tribunal to try the validity of such elections.

March 14.—*The Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Bill.*—Committee. On clause 1 (Paliamentary Nominations) Mr. Neville-Grenville proposed an amendment providing that the number of electors signing the nomination paper should be "not less than" eight, and that in the case of a county two at least of such electors should be from each polling district.—Negatived.—Mr. Gregory proposed an amendment to prevent candidates from being put in nomination without their consent.—Mr. W. E. Forster pointed out that a similar proposal had been rejected last year by a large majority, and after some debate the proposal was rejected by 265 to 108.—Mr. Denison proposed an amendment, the effect of which would have been to create an interval of five days between the nomination and the election. After some discussion this amendment was negatived, Mr. Forster having promised to consider a point made by Mr. Hunt that no provision was made for death of a candidate between the nomination and election.—In reply to Mr. Cross, Mr. Forster promised to introduce words providing for the immediate notification to the constituency of the candidates nominated.—Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens moved a proviso in the middle of clause 1, charging the returning officers' expenses on the Consolidated Fund. Voting by Ballot would greatly increase the expenses of elections, and it was hard to charge them to the candidates.—Mr. Forster, in opposing the proviso, denied that elections would be more costly under the Ballot, but whatever the sums might be he agreed that the candidates ought not to pay them; still he preferred Mr. Fawcett's idea that they should be debited to the rates, and the Government would support that plan at the proper time; the cost would not be more than seven-tenths of a farthing in the pound in England, and four-tenths in Scotland and Ireland. To put the charge on the Consolidated Fund would stimulate contests, and the Treasury would be quite unable to check the expenditure.—Colonel Barttelot and Mr. Barrow opposed the proviso.—Serjeant Sherlock, Mr. Synan, Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson and Mr. M'Laren supported it.—Mr. Melly and Mr. Morrison advocated throwing the charge on the rates.—Mr. Brand thought that as service in Parliament was an Imperial duty these expenses ought to be borne out of the Imperial funds. He was anxious for the admission of working men into Parliament but he objected to any new charge on the rates unless safeguards were provided against an unfair incidence. As it was, he supported the proviso.—Mr. H. James opposed it. He denied that the election expenses now kept men of moderate means out of Parliament, and pointed out that if the proviso were adopted there would always be selfish, restless spirits who would promote contests for the benefit of the tradespeople, at the expense of the ratepayers.—Mr. Fawcett wished to relieve candidates as far as possible from expenses, but strongly opposed throwing these expenses on the Consolidated Fund. The many communications he had received from all parts of the country showed that his own proposal of throwing the expenses on the rates was favoured by public opinion. If the local rates had to bear the burden there would be stronger motives for economy, and it would act as a moral lesson to the constituencies.—Mr. Gladstone still favoured Mr. Fawcett's pro-

posal to charge these expenses to the rates. He attached considerable importance to the technical objection that the Imperial funds could not be charged except with the consent of the Government. The Treasury could not check the details of this expenditure, and there would ensue constant struggles between the Treasury and the local authorities; while the certainty of drawing on the Consolidated Fund would multiply needless and frivolous contests.—Mr. Disraeli was equally opposed to charging the rates and the Consolidated Fund.—The proviso was negatived by 362 to 54. A proposal by Mr. Cawley that a candidate shall be at liberty to retire at any time before the poll, was negatived by 206 to 144; and progress was reported without clause 1 having been agreed to.

OBITUARY.

MR. WESTON APLIN.

Mr. Weston Aplin, solicitor, of Chipping Norton, in Oxfordshire, died on the 3rd of March, in the eighty-first year of his age. Mr. Aplin was certificated in 1819, and in the same year was appointed Town Clerk of the borough of Chipping Norton, which office he held for the long period of fifty-two years. In October, 1871, he was compelled, by reason of age and bodily weakness, to resign the Town Clerkship, when the Town Council passed a resolution expressing regret at his retirement, and recording their respect and esteem for him. His partner, Mr. G. H. Saunders, was then appointed to succeed him as town clerk.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society, on Tuesday last (Mr. Austin in the chair), the question discussed was ccvi., jurisprudential—"Would the refusal of the American Government to withdraw all claims for indirect damage growing out of the *Alabama* controversy, justify Great Britain in declining to proceed with the Geneva Arbitration?" The debate was opened on the affirmative side by Mr. Hunter (for Mr. Warnington), who was followed by Messrs. Russell and Corbin on the negative, and Mr. Gibb on the affirmative side. An animated discussion ensued, and at a late hour Mr. Sturdy moved the adjournment of the debate, which motion the society negatived. The question was finally decided in the affirmative by a majority of one vote.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's Inn Hall on Wednesday, Mr. H. Lewis Arnold in the chair. Mr. Debney opened the subject for the evening's debate—viz., "That the recent appointment of Sir Robert Collier is to be condemned." The motion was carried *nem. con.*

COURT PAPERS.

STATUTORY DECLARATIONS.

The following are the regulations as to taking statutory declarations, affidavits, and acknowledgment of deeds, now in force at the Mansion-house. We reprint them for the assistance of justices' clerks in general:—

1. *Office hours.*] From 12 till 2, or while the Lord Mayor or an alderman is in attendance; on Saturdays 11 till 2.

2. *Form of documents.*] Documents must be brought ready prepared or filled up. The following is the jurat to be written on the left-hand corner of the affidavit or declaration for the magistrate's signature:

"Sworn [or declared] at the Mansion House, in the City of London, this [twenty-seventh day of [June], 1871. Before me, [Signature of party making it.]

"———— Lord Mayor [or Alderman], and J.P."

All documents annexed or referred to in the affidavit or declaration as exhibits should have the following written on them, for the magistrate's signature:—

"This is the [paper, writing, or deed, or power of attorney, as it may be called in the affidavit or declaration] mentioned or referred to in the affidavit [or declaration] of ———— sworn [or made] before me, this —— day of —— 1871.

"———— Lord Mayor [or Alderman] and J.P."

3. Declarations must be in the form prescribed by the Statutory Declaration Act, 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 62, s. 20 (blank forms of which can be had of the marshal or clerk in attendance), unless a special form is required by any revenue department, or by a subsequent or other Act.

4. *Oath, &c.*] The oath or declaration, as the case may be, will be administered in the "Affidavit room" by the marshal or clerk in attendance, who will obtain the signature of the magistrate thereto.

5. *Subject of affidavit or declaration.*] The subject-matter and the facts set forth in the affidavit or declaration will be examined, and only such affidavit as is authorised by law (see paragraph 6), or such declaration as appears to be "necessary and proper" (*a*), will be taken.

6. *When affidavits are the proper instruments.*] Affidavits must be such as justices are authorised by some statute to take (*b*); and if under a foreign or colonial law (*c*) in order to give validity to instruments designed to be used there, the Act or a verified extract from it should be produced (*d*). In all other cases where the document is required for a foreign country or the colony of Victoria (*e*), an affidavit seems to be the proper document to be made.

7. *When declarations are the proper instruments.*] As a general rule, declarations should be made in all cases where they are required to be used in the United Kingdom, and in our colonies, except Victoria (*e*). Declarations may also be made in all the cases referred to in paragraph 6 wherein an affidavit is necessary.

8. *Magistrate will not attest party's signature.*] The magistrate will not attest the signature of any party to any deed or instrument brought to be acknowledged or verified, unless, in the case of a deed or instrument made under a foreign or colonial law, it shall be shown that such law requires it to be so attested.

9. *Party must be personally known.*] No certificate of character, or for a passport, or otherwise, will be signed by the magistrate, unless the person referred to be personally known to him, or to an official of the court.

10. *Acknowledgment or ratification of deeds, &c., by married women and other parties.*] These are taken by the Lord Mayor as the chief magistrate of the City, under various foreign and colonial laws, or in his absence by one of the aldermen who has passed the chair as his *Locum tenens*, in the form required by those laws respectively, as well as according to the law and practice of Scotland (*g*). It is necessary that the parties, or the solicitor or other person introducing them, should be identified or known to the magistrate or one of the officials of the court, as the parties described in the deed or other instrument.

11. *Corporation or mayoralty Seal.*] Documents to be sent abroad requiring this seal, after being verified before the Lord Mayor, or his *Locum tenens*, should be taken to the office of "The Lord Mayor's Court," Church-passage, Guildhall, where the seal will be affixed, for which a fee of 9s. 6d. is there payable, where one deponent or declarant, and each extra, 2s. The seal may be obtained at that office between the hours of 10 and 4; on Saturdays between 10 and 2.

12. *Court fees.*] For affidavit or declaration unstamped, 1s. each person; if stamped, 1s. 6d. each person. Every exhibit, 1s. Acknowledgment of deed, 3s. 6d. each party. No fee is charged on pawnbrokers' declarations, where the article has been pledged for a sum less than 20s., or for declarations required by friendly societies and charitable institutions, or for Government pensioners or annuitants, or for affidavits in Irish bankruptcies.

13. *Stamp duty on affidavits and declarations.*] By the Stamp Act, 1870, 33 & 34 Vict. c. 97 (schedule "Affidavit") a duty of 2s. 6d. is payable on an "affidavit, or statutory declaration under the provisions of 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 62," from which there are these "exemptions," viz:—

"(1.) Affidavit made for the immediate purpose of being filed, read, or used in court, or before any judge, master, or officer of any court.

(2.) Affidavit or declaration made upon a requisition of the commissioners of any public board of revenue, or any of the officers acting under them, or required by law, and made before any justice of the peace.

(3.) Affidavit or declaration which may be required at the bank of England or the bank of Ireland to prove the death of any proprietor of any stock transferable there, or

to indentify the person of any such proprietor, or to remove any other impediment to the transfer of any such stock.

(4.) Affidavit or declaration relating to the loss, mutilation, or defacement of any bank note or bank post bill.

(5.) Declaration required to be made pursuant to any act relating to marriages in order to a marriage without a license."

No affidavit or declaration tendered by a party will, however, be rejected by the magistrate for want of this revenue stamp.

By order of the Lord Mayor,
GEORGE C. OKE.

Justice-Room, Mansion House, July, 1871.

(*a*) The Statutory Declaration Act, 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 62, authorises the taking of a Declaration in relation to actions in our Colonies (s. 15) except Victoria (Note *e*); and of execution of wills or deeds (s. 16); and also by s. 18 where "it may be *necessary and proper* in many cases, not herein specified, to require confirmation of written instruments or allegations, or proof of debts, or of the execution of deeds or other matters." Declarations will, therefore, not be received respecting immoral practices, or involving criminal charges or supposed criminal charges, affecting the declarant or other persons, whether or not they are the subject of proceedings commenced, pending, or determined, nor in any other improper case. Of course, an affidavit of the same purport cannot be taken.

(*b*) Justices are authorised to take affidavits in these cases, amongst others:—Affidavits to be used in any matter in bankruptcy under the English Bankruptcy Acts (Rule No. 157, dated 1st January, 1870, made pursuant to 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, s. 78); affidavits in proof of debts under the Irish Bankruptcy Act (20 & 21 Vict. c. 60, s. 366); and under the Scotch Sequestration Act (19 & 20 Vict. c. 79, s. 22); any affidavit to be used in a County Court (9 & 10 Vict. c. 95, s. 62; 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, s. 58); affidavits of the service of process from the Vice-Warden's Court of the Stannaries of Cornwall and Devon (18 & 19 Vict. c. 32, s. 8); affidavits in proof of compliance with Commons' Standing Orders of Parliament, before examiner of petitions and committees on private bills (Orders 77, 139); affidavits made for the purposes of the Stamp and Stamp Duties Management Acts, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. cc. 97, 98, s. 27).

(*c*) For Tobago, Canada, New Brunswick, the Isle of Man, &c., an affidavit is required.

(*d*) These are exempted from the Statutory Declaration Act by section 13.

(*e*) The Act as to Victoria is the 22 & 23 Vict. c. 12.

(*f*) See Statutory Declaration Act, 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 62, ss. 13, 15, 18, and note (*a*).

(*g*) The ratification of deeds for Scotland is exempted from the Statutory Declaration Act of 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 62, by the 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 43.

*** We are indebted for the above to the courtesy of Mr Oke.

HIGH COURT OF CHANCERY.

TRANSFER OF CAUSES.

The Lord Chancellor has ordered that the several causes in the First Schedule undermentioned be transferred from the Book of Causes standing for hearing before the Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins to the Book of Causes for hearing before the Master of the Rolls; and that the several causes in the Second Schedule undermentioned be transferred from the Book of Causes standing for hearing before the Vice-Chancellor Sir John Wickens to the Book of Causes for hearing before the Master of the Rolls.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

From the Vice-Chancellor SIR RICHARD MALINS' Book.

	Ref.	to Record.
Lindgren v Horne Cause	1870	I. 47
Tomkins v Parker Motion for Decree	1870	T. 40
Tomkins v Parker Ditto	1870	T. 41
Dixon v Muckleston Ditto	1870	D. 50
Underdown v Stannard Cause	1870	U. 16
Faulkner v Pares Cause set down at request of defendant	1870	F. 36
Giacometti v Prodgers Motion for Decree	1871	G. 51
Gurney v Temple ditto	1871	G. 12
Shepheard v McCorquodale Ditto	1868	S. 198
Murchison v Southgate Cause with Witnesses	1871	M. 56
Kimber v. Barber Motion for Decree	1870	K 37
Talbot v Frere Ditto	1871	T. 33
Hayes v Oatler Ditto	1871	H. 1
Shearman v British Empire Mutual Life Assurance Co Ditto	1871	S. 2
Ballard v Sanders Cause	1871	B. 43
Kerry v Ovitts Motion for Decree	1871	K. 16
Howell v Smith Ditto	1871	P. 100
The Planet Assurance Corporation (Limited) v McLeavey Cause	1870	P. 204
The Planet Assurance Corporation (Limited) v O'Reardon Ditto	1870	P. 205
The Sceptre Life Association (Limited) v The Munster Bank (Limited) Ditto	1871	S. 15
The Sceptre Life Association (Limited) v Mahony Ditto	1871	S. 11
The Sceptre Life Association (Limited) v Murphy Ditto	1871	S. 14
Emmet v Rickards Motion for Decree	1871	E. 16
Edwards v Loftus Motion for decree set down at request of defendants J. A. Edwards and Others	1870	E. 30
Watts v Metropolitan Railway Company Motion for Decree	1871	W. 207
Tock v Foster Ditto	1871	T. 26
The Mercers' Company v Metropolitan Board of Works Cause	1871	M. 23
Baker v Loader Cause and motion in Packham v Rastrick	1870	B. 293
Perry v Ashcroft Motion for Decree	1871	P. 131
North v Combe Ditto	1871	N. 18
Elkington v Raphael Ditto	1871	E. 36
Pearson v Hooper Ditto	1871	P. 5
Gilbert v Guignon Cause	1869	G. 7
Festiniog Slate Quarry Company (Limited) v Festiniog Railway Company Cause set down at request of defendant company	1868	F. 121
Whittington Life Assurance Company v General Provincial Life Assurance Co. (Ld.) Motion for Decree	1868	W. 53
Allan v Davidson Ditto	1871	A. 88
Law Reversionary Interest Society v Stuart Ditto	1870	L. 123
Ball v Ball Ditto	1871	B. 33
Line v Hall Ditto	1871	L. 84
Evans v Evans Ditto	1870	E. 61
Johnson v Johnson Ditto	1870	J. 95
Hassell v Wright Ditto	1870	H. 72
Candy v Candy Ditto	1872	C. 2
Laffitte v Gibbons Cause	1869	L. 43
Laffitte v M'Kenna, Knt. Ditto	1869	L. 63
Stuart v Gurney Motion for Decree	1871	S. 78
Coward v Inman Ditto	1871	C. 88
Price v Price Ditto	1871	P. 120
Harrison v Watson Cause	1871	H. 161
Beach v. Wright and Another Ditto, pro confesso against defendant Wright	1871	B. 176
Cubitt v Watney Motion for Decree	1871	C. 56
Smith v Adkins Cause	1871	S. 18
Austin v Austin Ditto	1871	A. 40
Brooke v Lowe Motion for Decree	1871	B. 77
Kent v Riley Cause, with Witnesses	1871	K. 19
Jay v Rowles Cause	1870	J. 102
Sabin v. Holyman Motion for Decree	1871	S. 192
Burder v Hills Ditto	1871	B. 106
Clowes v Hogg Cause, with Witnesses	1870	C. 253
Newell v Newell Cause	1871	N. 30

THE SECOND SCHEDULE.

From the Vice-Chancellor Sir JOHN WICKENS' Book.

Yonge v London & Paris Hotel Company, Limited Motion for Decree	1871	Y. 6
Shaw v Parratt Ditto	1871	S. 159
Clarke v Lewis Ditto	1870	C. 224
Tozer v Trewman Ditto	1869	T. 97
Stemp v Wadwell Cause, with Witnesses	1870	S. 242
Nugent v Moseley Motion for Decree	1871	N. 12
Powell v Stanborough Ditto	1871	P. 94
Bray v Briggs Ditto	1871	B. 134
Great Eastern Railway Company v Turner Ditto	1871	G. 67
Wells v Bremner Ditto	1871	W. 60
Mott v Scale Ditto	1871	M. 130
Hutchinson v Geldart Ditto	1871	H. 105
Taylor v Stevens Ditto	1871	T. 103
Wilshaw v Perry Ditto	1871	W. 72
Hindley v Neale Ditto	1871	H. 104
Boultbee v Kemp Ditto	1871	B. 120
Mildon v Mudford Cause	1871	M. 151
Pinto-Leite v Knowles Motion for Decree	1871	L. 107
Ashmore v Johnson Ditto	1871	A. 53
Benson v Benson Ditto	1871	B. 209
Watkins v Fuller Ditto	1870	W. 160
Ditto	1869	H. 69

		Ref. to Record.		
Sheppard v Leacroft	Ditto	1870	S.	318
Honychurch v Queen Insurance Company				
Knowles v Pinto-Leite	Ditto	1871	K.	24
Chatwood the younger v The East London Railway Company	Ditto	1871	C.	25
Locking v Parker	Ditto	1871	L.	79
Hall v Lee	Ditto	1870	H.	303
Master v Richards	Ditto.	1870	M.	255
Harris v Holt	Ditto	1871	H.	24
Shawcross v Lomax	Ditto	1870	S.	288
Viscount Valentia v Denton	Cause	1867	V.	34
Fiddey v Bramble	Ditto	1871	F.	55
Campbell v Campbell	Motion for Decree	1871	C.	64
Leake v Hunt	Cause pro confesso	1871	L.	109
Bartlett v West	Motion for Decree	1871	B.	221
Hall v Millward	Ditto	1871	H.	116
Allen v. Edwards	Ditto	1871	A.	102
Willcox & Gibbs Sewing Machine Company v Wilson	Motion for Decree Witnesses at hearing, by order	1871	W.	31
Dadds v Jefferys	Motion for Decree	1871	D.	67
Dadds v Collard	Ditto	1871	D.	85

SURREY SPRING ASSIZES, 1872.

ENTRY OF CAUSES.

Causes can be provisionally entered at the office of the Clerk of Assize for the Home Circuit, in London, on Monday, the 18th March, and daily thereafter until Saturday, the 23rd March, inclusive, between the hours of Ten and Two.

They will be formally entered and put on the list at Kingston by the Clerk of Assize, in the order of their provisional entry, and before causes entered at Kingston.

In case any record entered in London be withdrawn before the opening of the commission at Kingston, the entry stamp, will be returned.

A list of causes for trial each day will be sent to London in the evening of the previous day, and will be affixed outside the Porter's Lodge, Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, and also outside the office of Mr. Abbott, the Under Sheriff, No. 8, New Inn, Strand, as soon as possible after the list can be arranged.

The First Day's List will not extend beyond the 20th Common Jury in the List of Causes provisionally entered, should there be so many. The List of Causes provisionally entered may be seen at the London Office of the Clerk of the Assize till Two o'clock on Saturday, the 23rd March.

No cause will be allowed to be entered under any circumstances after the sitting of the Court.

This arrangement may not apply to future Assizes.

MR. JUSTICE GROVE AT SWANSEA.

Mr. Justice Grove, on opening the commission of the Glamorganshire Lent Assizes at Swansea, his native town, was presented with a congratulatory address by the town council. His lordship replied as follows:—"It is no trifling thing to be made a judge. It is not a matter, as many suppose, to call forth feelings of gratified vanity. It is the undertaking of high and difficult duties of no ordinary character. A judge has to combine firmness with good temper, to possess patience without timidity, to be ready to give unwearying attention, and to sink all idea of self in the performance of the duties of his office. The education of a judge in this country differs from that in many other countries. Here judges are chosen from those who have had long experience at the bar, and no education, in my opinion, is so suitable for mental discipline. High independence, combined with habits of self-repression and submission to authority, the cultivation and improvement of many faculties, and the transmission of feelings of honour and self-respect, are furnished by this more than by any other training. The eminent historian Guicciardini has said that the liberties of a nation may be judged of by the position of the bar. Where this is high and independent, the country possesses free institutions; where this is low and servile, the country is enslaved. With regard to what has been said in reference to my connection with Swansea, the deep feeling which I entertain for those who stand before me has been roused by the words of congratulation now tendered in a way which I could hardly have believed. You have alluded to my scientific career. It was from my grandfather that I received my first notions of physical science. I can recollect, when no more than seven or eight years old, hearing from him an explanation why three planets above the horizon at the same time would be always nearly in a straight line, they being necessarily in the plane of the ecliptic. But from grandfather and father, and from the gentle, unselfish woman who gave me birth, I have received still more valuable lessons. I have by them been taught truth, integrity, and self-dependence, and I hope their instruction has not been profitless."

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Mar. 15, 1872.

From the Official List of the actual business transacted.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92⅝
Ditto for Account, April 5, 92⅞
3 per Cent. Reduced 91¼
New 3 per Cent., 91¼
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73
Annuities, Jan. '80 —
Annuities, April, '85
Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
Ex Bills, £1000, — per Ct. 4 p m
Ditto, £500, Do — 4 p m
Ditto, £100 & £200, — 4 p m
Bank of England Stock, 4½ per Ct. (last half-year) 249
Ditto for Account.

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing prices
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	103
Stock	Caledonian	100	117⅞
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	128
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	50
Stock	Great Northern	100	135
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	158½
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	112½
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	157½
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	79½
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	27½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	154½ x d
Stock	London and South-Western	100	108½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	74
Stock	Metropolitan	100	69½
Stock	Midland	100	144½
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby	100	111
Stock	North British	100	62½
Stock	North London	100	125
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	79
Stock	South Devon	100	74
Stock	South-Eastern	100	98
Stock	Taff Vale	100	160

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

During the earlier part of the week all the markets, the funds included, were heavy and drooping, a state of things which was fostered to some extent by a large drain of bullion to South America, and the anticipated issue of a new Peruvian Loan. In the railway market a large amount of sales took place. Subsequently an improvement manifested itself all round; after the fortnightly settlement railway stocks became in steady demand. Erie and other American stocks have been freely dealt in since the news anticipatory of the final rescue of Erie.

The Lombard Syndicate (Limited), instructed by the agent of the State of Arkansas, and of the Arkansas Central Railway Company, invite applications for the amount of 2,165,000 dols., Seven per cent. State bonds in 2,165 bonds of 1,000 dols. each, at the price of 65 per cent. (exchange 4s. 6d. per dollar) or £146 5s. sterling per bond. The bonds being in favour of the "bearer," are negotiable by simple delivery, and bear interest by Coupon, payable half-yearly in New York by the Treasurer of the State, on the 1st of April and 1st of October in each year, until redemption at par of the principal of the bonds. The bonds now offered for subscription are being emitted by the State in aid of the construction of the Arkansas Central Railway, a line which will open up the districts of the State, and prove of immense benefit to the interests of the whole population as a connecting link between various important lines of railroad which, when completed, will render the State of Arkansas one of the most important railway centres in the South.

The shareholders' committee of the Erie Railway have issued a circular requesting shareholders to deposit their certificates immediately with them at the offices of Messrs. Bischoffsheim & Goldschmidt, who will issue certificates, and as soon as practicable apply for a quotation upon the Stock Exchange. Should any depositor prefer the shares registered in his own name, the committee will have the registration perfected free of expense, receiving the proprietor's proxy.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

March 13.—By Messrs. CHINNOCK, GALSWORTHY & CHINNOCK.

Chiswick.—No. 3, Grove-park-road, freehold. Sold £1,100.

By Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD.

Wallington.—Cathcart-road, plot of building land, 60 feet by 235 feet. Sold £290.

Islington.—Nos. 18, 19, and 20, Oxford-terrace, freehold, and a freehold ground rent of £16 per annum. Sold £2,200.

By Messrs. TEMPLE & MOORE.

Horselydown.—Nos. 21, 23, 25, and 27, Queen-street, term 39 years. Sold £720.

Nos. 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42, same street and term. Sold £875.

Nos. 44 and 46, Queen-street, and Nos. 58, 59, 59A, and 60, Gainsford-street, same term. Sold £750.

Messrs. REYNOLDS & EASON.

Queen Victoria-street.—Nos. 11, 12, and 13, Huggin-lane, freehold, area 750 superficial feet. Sold £2,010.

By Messrs. WINSTANLEY & HORWOOD.

London-wall, Nos. 112 and 113.—The lease together with the goodwill, term 7 years. Sold £760.

By Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE.

Mile-end.—Nos. 52 and 53, Allas-road, term 95 years. Sold £900.

Bromley-by-Bow.—Freehold residence, Sherwood House. Sold £700.

Lower Edmonton.—A double fronted residence, term 97 years. Sold £650.

AT THE GUILDHALL TAVERN.

March 13.—By Messrs. INGLEDEW & Co.

Pimlico.—Nos. 5 to 8, Belgrave-buildings, term 15 years. Sold £585.

By Mr. H. E. MARSH.

Regents's Park.—No. 161, Albany-street; term 44 years: sold for £150. Gray's-inn-road, No. 119; term, 20 years. Sold £415. Nos. 13 and 14, Brownlow-mews; same term. Sold £130.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

DICKINS—On Jan. 17, at 172, Bluff, Yokohama, Japan, the wife of F. V. Dickins, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

SMITH—On the morning of March 10, at 3, Eaton-place, the wife of W. J. Bernhard Smith, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.

DEATHS.

CLARK—On March 1, at Holbeach, Alfred Clark, Esq., attorney, aged 46.

TIMES—On March 12, at Hitchin, Herts, Charles Times, Esq., solicitor, aged 57.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1872.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Lincoln's inn fields Hotel Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented March 4, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Wickens on March 15. Hensman and Nicholson, College hill, solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, March 12, 1872.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Royal Naval, Military, and East India Company Life Assurance Society.—Vice Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated March 1, ordered that the above company be wound up. Wilkins and Co, St Swithin's lane, solicitors for the petitioner.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Bristol Victoria Pottery Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated March 2, ordered that the above Company be wound up. Whites and Co, Budge row, Cannon st; Press and Inskip, Bristol, solicitors for the petitioners.

County Palatine Loan and Discount Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented March 8, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Malins on March 22. Gregory and Co, Bedford row; agents for Bremner and Son, Lpool, solicitors for the petitioners.

Middleton Cotton Spinning and Manufacturing Company (Limited).—Vice Chancellor Wickens has, by an order dated March 4, ordered that the above company be wound up; and that Thos Bailey Bromley, 12a, Commercial bldgs, Cross st, Manch, and John Whittaker, 35, Corporation st, Manch, be appointed official liquidators. Bower and Cotton, Chancery lane; agents for Gardner and Horner, Manch, solicitors for the petitioners.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1872.

Barnet Friendly Society, The Hall, Chipping Barnet, Herts. March 8

Dorchester Tradesmen's and Mechanics' Friendly Society, Royal Oak Inn, Dorchester. March 1

Royal Mersey Sick and Funeral Benefit Society, Albert Dock Warehouses, Lpool. March 1

TUESDAY, March 12, 1872.

Cambridge Union Benefit Society, North Pole Tavern, Oxford st. March 9

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1872.

Bowden, Jas, Bedford-sq. April 15. Maples v Jay, V.C. Wickens. Young & Co, Frederick's-pl, Old Jewry

Drake, Wm, East Dereham, Norfolk, Gent. March 27. Barwell v Drake, V.C. Malins. Saunders, East Dereham

Lewin, Wm, Boston, Lincoln, Civil Engineer. April 6. Lewin v Lewin. V.C. Wickens. White, Boston

Mitchell, Wm, Huddersfield, York, Ironfounder. April 15. Walker v Lawton, V.C. Wickens. Learoyd, Huddersfield

Siggers, Jas, Newcastle-st, Strand, Gent. April 8. Gray v Siggers, M.R. Nicholson & Co, Lime-st

TUESDAY, March 12, 1872.

Armitstead, Robt, Killington, Westmoreland, Yeoman. April 10. Waller v Killington, V.C. Malins. Robinson, Sedbergh

Colthorpe, Sarah Ann, Occold, Suffolk. March 31. Read v Harris, V.C. Bacon. Roy & Cartwright, Lothbury

Hatfield, Weston Jas, Cambridge, Newspaper Proprietor. April 10. Bond v Hatfield, M.R. Eaden, Cambridge

Heath, Thos, Fairfield, nr Lpool, Gent. April 8. Atcherley v Heath, V.C. Malins. Barrell, Lpool

Quick, Jas Stevens, St Ives, Cornwall. Retired Master Mariner. April 8. Quick v Quick, M.R. Bamfield, St Ives

Rowley, Wm, Birm, Pearl Button Manufacturer. April 4. Rowley v Ford, M.R. Wood, Birm

Sweet, Alfred, Cookham Dean, Berks, Gent. April 6. Sweet v Sweet, V.C. Malins. Baddeley jun, Leman-st, Goodman's-fields

Taylor, Chas Lane, Beaulieu Gorey, nr St Heliers, Jersey, Esq. April 8. Eddowes v Parker, V.C. Malins. Parker, Bedford-row

NEXT OF KIN.

Alexander, Mary, Clifton, nr Bristol, Widow. April 30. Knight v Gibson, V.C. Wickens.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1872.

Ainscow, Geo, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Lancashire, Publican. May 1. Crowther, Manch

Barton, Jane, North House, Brentford. March 31. Moginie, Riding-house-st

Baxter, Chris, Ipswich, Suffolk, Gent. April 15. Addons & Pearce, Ipswich

Borton, John Hy, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, Esq. April 27. Bromley, Bedford row

Brett, Rev Philip, Mount Bures, Essex. May 31. Howard & Co, Colchester

Cobby, Geo Kemp, Sheffield, Coal Merchant. April 11. Watson, Sheffield

Cresswell, Cresswell, Leicester, Gent. May 1. Stevenson, Leicester

Cuffe, Lucien Wm, Oxford-ter, Edgware-rd, Barrister-at-law. April 30. Woodrooffe & Plaskitt, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn

David, Eliz, Heaton Norris, Lancashire, Widow. April 2. Brown, Stockport

Dunn, Danl, Canonbury-sq, Islington, Gent. May 6. Broughton, Finsbury-sq

Dunn, Eliz, Canonbury-sq, Islington, Widow. May 6. Broughton, Finsbury-sq

Fisher, Joseph Chas, Cripplegate-bldgs, Warehouseman. April 30. Smith, Lincoln's-inn-fields

Foskett, Rev Thos Moore, Abernethy House, Hampstead. May 5. Avory & Son, Sessions House, Old Bailey

Hockin, Eliz, Bude, Cornwall, Widow. May 1. Whittington & Co, Bristol

Jackson, Sir Jas, United Service Club, Pall-mall. May 6. Lawrie & Co, Dean's-ct, Doctors'-commons

Lazenby, Rev Hy Paul, Thistleton, Rutland. May 4. Wilson & Co, Cranbrook

Mancell, Walter, Laurence Pountney-hill, Solicitor. May 8. Hubbard & Son, Bucklersbury

Mendoza, Moses, High-st, Aldgate, Tailor. April 1. Stanley Austin Friars

Poulter, Charlotte, Allen-ter, Kensington, Widow. April 13. Fox & Robinson, Gresham House, Old Broad-st

Ramsden, John, Lower Wellhouse, Huddersfield, York, out of business. April 23. Ramsden, Huddersfield

Reynolds, Hannah Mary, Bristol, Widow. May 1. Whittington & Co, Bristol

Rigden, Wm, Faversham, Kent, Banker. Oct 1. Wightwick & Kingsford, Canterbury

Sutton, Helen, Springfield-rd, St John's Wood, Widow. May 1. Jolf & Goule, Birm

Watson, Edwin, Birm, Solicitor. May 1. James & Oorton, Birm

Wilson, Fras White, Thornaby, York, Farmer. May 18. Newby & Co, Stockton-on-Tees

Wingate, Eliz, Darlington, Durham, Spinster. March 30. Hodgson & McKeever, Wigton

TUESDAY, March 12, 1872.

Archer, John, Hill-st, Peckham, Gent. May 1. Godden, Fenchurch-st

Barter, Eliz, Rockville, Albert-rd, South Norwood. April 30. Lewin & Co, Southampton-st, Strand

Battensby, Jane Sophia, Queen's-crescent, Haverstock-hill. April 10. Davies & Co, Warwick-st, Regent-st

Beech, Thos Spring Lake, Walbrook, Tobacconist. May 6. Harcourt & Macarthur, Moorgate-st

Blackner, John, Sneinton, Nottingham, Farmer. May 18. Cockayne, Nottingham

Brown, Eliz, Blue Town, Sheerness, Kent, Baker. May 13. Copland, Sheerness

Davidson, Robt, Norfolk-sq, Hyde-pk, Merchant. April 26. Robertson, Duke-st, Westminster

Dexter, Peter, Panton-st, Goldsmith. April 20. Pike & Son, Old Burlington-st
England, Wm, Ipswich, Suffolk, Esq, M.D. April 6. Fraser & Watson, Wisbech
Ferriday, Chas Jas, Madeley, Salop, Esq. May 1. Potts, Broseley
Firth, Benj, Manningham, York, Top Maker. May 1. Hargreaves, Bradford
Green, Wm, Kingston-upon-Hull, Gent. April 13. England & Co, Kingston-upon-Hull
Grisewood, Harman, Daylesford House, Worcester. May 1. Travers & Co, Throgmorton-st
Hall, Abraham, Quarmby, nr Huddersfield, Woollen Manufacturer. May 1. Harker & Sons, Huddersfield
Hammerton, John Harrop, Henley-on-Thames, Oxford, Gent. April 15. Rawson & Best, Leeds
Harding, Catherine Anna Maria, Mitcheldean, Gloucester, Spinster. April 10. Valpy & Chaplin, Lincoln's-inn-fields
Howard, Wm, Exeter, High Constable. May 1. Hooper, Exeter
Hudson, Fras, Enderby, Leicester, Widow. April 30. Berridge & Morris, Leicester
Jones, Thos, Crossblethin, Monmouth, Farmer. April 15. Brown, Grovesend, nr Thornbury
Litler, Robt, Hartford, Chester. April 1. Fletcher, Northwich
Newbald, Wm, Kingston-upon-Hull, Warfinger. April 21. Hill, Hull
Oulton, Rachel, Chester. April 1. Fletcher, Northwich
Perry, John, Anerley-rd, Upper Norwood, Gent. May 9. Fox, Chancery-lane
Ponsonby, Geo Glenn, Master of the "Geraint." May 4. Dalrymple, Cullum-st
Presland, John, Wells-st, Westminster, Licensed Victualler. April 9. Robinson, Jermyn-st
Reyner, Alfred, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. April 30. Cunliffe & Leaf, Manch
Scott, Alfred, Gracechurch-st, Coal Factor. April 20. Lambert & Ramskill, Fenchurch-st
Secker, John, New Windsor, Berks, Esq. April 30. Meynell & Pemberton, Whitehall-pl, Westminster
Sims, Wm, Jermyn-st, St James's, Dairyman. April 25. Cobb, Lincoln's-inn-fields
Stronell, Edwd Dell, Amersham, Bucks, Gent. May 1. Cheese, Amersham
Teale, Chas, Alderton, Gloucester, Farmer. May 15. Badham & Co, Tewkesbury
Thompson, Wm Hy, Paymaster R.N. H.M.S. "Royal Oak." March 31. Ommanney, Norfolk-st, Strand
Walton, Eliz, Tynemouth, Northumberland, Widow. April 8. Dale, North Shields
Winn, Nancy Louisa, St Alban's-rd, Victoria-rd, Kensington. April 20. Goody & Stock, Skinner's-pl, Size-lane
Wyndham, Hon Julia Constantia, Connaught-ter, Widow. April 10. Murray, Whitehall-pl
Young, Richd, Walsoken, Norfolk, Merchant. June 1. Jackson, Wisbech

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1872.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Blanchard, Sydney Lamán, Baker-st, Portman-sq. Pet March 6. Hazlitt. March 22 at 11
Heymann, Moritz, Hildrop-rd, Camden Town, Warehouseman. Pet March 6. Hazlitt. March 22 at 12
Pallaer, Saml, Baker-st, Outfitter. Pet March 5. Hazlitt. March 21 at 11
Snelling, Fras, jun, and John Snelling, Houndsditch, Warehousemen. Pet March 8. Spring-Rice. March 21 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Beeston, John, Woore, Salop, Innkeeper. Pet March 5. Speakman. Crewe, March 22 at 11
Escherich, Julius, and Edwin Baring, Plymouth, Devon, Provision Merchants. Pet March 2. Pearce. East Stonehouse, March 27 at 11
Harmer, Hy, jun, Hadlow, Kent, Innkeeper. Pet March 2. Alleyne. Tunbridge Wells, March 4 at 2
Roberts, Fielding, Scout Bottom, nr Newchurch, Lancashire, Wheelwright. Pet March 4. Tweedale. Oldham, March 20 at 12
Salt, Ald. Richd Perry and Wm Fellows, Stafford, Shoe Manufacturers. Pet March 5. Spilsbury. Stafford, March 26 at 11

TUESDAY, March 12, 1872.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Berkeley, Geo Lennox Rawdon, out of England. Pet March 8. Spring-Rice. April 11 at 11
Hill, Jas Croucher, and Jas Spicer Kennard, Cable-st, St George's East, Cork Merchants. Pet March 6. Murray. March 26 at 11
Morris, Fredk, Mark-lane, General Merchant. Pet March 8. Murray. March 26 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Avery, John, Aigburth, nr Lpool, out of business. Pet March 7. Watson. Lpool, March 28 at 2
Bubb, Arthur, and Hy Wilson Harris, Lpool, Merchants. Pet March 7. Watson, Lpool, March 29 at 2
Hombray, Chas Gould Morgan, Caerleon, nr Newport, Mon, Gent. Pet March 6. Roberts. Newport, March 26 at 1
Humberstone, Jas, Codnor, Derby, Draper. Pet March 8. Weller. Derby, March 28 at 12
Irvine, Chas Stuart, Bradford, York, Corn Dealer. Pet March 5. Robinson. Bradford, April 5 at 9
Kelly, Hannah, Harrogate, York, Draper. Pet March 8. Perkins. York, March 22 at 11
Sides, Thos, Birm, Fishmonger. Pet March 8. Chauntler. Birm, March 27 at 10
Silk, Wm Setterfield, Minster, Kent, Engineer. Pet March 8. Calloway. Canterbury, March 26 at 2
Smith, Robt, Burnley, Lancashire, Heald Manufacturer. Pet March 7. Hartley. Burnley, March 28 at 10
Wheldrake, Wm Simpson, Howden, York, Innkeeper. Pet March 7. Phillips. Kingston-upon-Hull, March 26 at 1
Williams, Stanley, Manch. Cloth Agent. Pet March 11. Kay. Manch, March 28 at 9.30

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1872.

Fabris, Fras Wm, Malda-vale, no occupation. March 1

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1872.

Batchelar, Wm, Swansea, Glamorgan, Agent. March 18 at 11, at 5, Rutland st, Swansea. Davies & Hartland
Bayliss, Robt, Burford, Oxon, Tailor. March 22 at 2, at the Bull Hotel, Burford
Beers, Geo, Nastone, Derby. March 18 at 3, at offices of Cowdell, Soresby st, Chesterfield
Benham, John Benj, Reading, Berks, Baker. March 23 at 11, at 3, Forbury, Reading. Rising
Blackwood, Adam, Hartlepool, Durham, Boiler Maker. March 21 at 12, at offices of Dobing & Simpson, Church st, West Hartlepool
Brae, Jas Allan, Elm rd, Camden Town, Mechanical Engineer. March 18 at 1, at offices of Shea, King William st
Brand, John, Billinghay, Lincoln, Miller. March 21 at 11, at office of Snow, Sleaford
Brokenshir, John, Hampton Wick, Middx, Commercial Traveller. March 21 at 12, at office of Wilkinson & Howlett, Bedford st, Covent garden
Bull, Edwd John, Halifax, York, Dealer in Bedding. March 22 at 3, at offices of Rhodes, Horton st, Halifax
Campbell, Wm, Leeds, out of business. March 23 at 3, at the Trevelyan Hotel, Corporation st, Manch
Conder, John, Southport, Lancashire, Innkeeper. March 22 at 3, at offices of Welsby & Hill, Lord st, Southport
Connell, John, High Ackworth, York, Innkeeper. March 21 at 12, at the Green Dragon Hotel, Pontefract. Barratt, Wakefield
Corbett, Chas Wm, Birm, Boiler Composition Manufacturer. March 22 at 11, at office of Duke, Christ Church passage, Birm
Cox, John, New Kent rd, Carver. March 15 at 3, at 23, St Martin's ct. Willis, St Martin's ct
Darney, Louis, & Thos Geo Prior, New Inn yd, Tottenham ct rd, Pianoforte Manufacturers. March 25 at 2, at offices of Williams, Alfred pl, Bedford sq
Degge, Joseph, & Frank Stockdale, Lpool, Agricultural Implement Dealers. March 25 at at 2, at office of Fowler & Carruthers, Clayton sq, Lpool
Digby, Edwd John, & Arthur Pearse, Chester, Linen Drapers. March 18 at 12, at offices of Crowther & Co, Bath chambers, York st, Manch. Taylor
Doling, Saml, Elson, Hants, Baker. March 19 at 4, at offices of King, Union st, Portsea
Drain, Wm, Copperhouse, Hayle, Cornwall, Fruiterer. March 20 at 2, at offices of Trevena, Princes st, Truro
Easlea, Wm, Stanton, Suffolk, Farmer. March 22 at 2, at the Angel Hotel, Bury St Edmunds. Walpole, Bury St Edmunds
Edmonds, Jas Darley, Roman rd, Old Ford, Cheesemonger. March 23 at 3, at office of Spiller, South pl, Finsbury
Ellison, John Wm, Crown st, Cheapside, Comm Agent. March 18 at 12, at offices of Reed & Lovell, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st
Fear, Frank, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Fish Merchant. March 16 at 11, at offices of Atwood, Baker st, Aberystwith
Footer, Hy, Guildford, Surrey, Builder. March 20 at 2, at office of Stevens, Portsmouth rd, Guildford
Foy, Michael Joseph, Leominster, Hereford, Bootmaker. March 20 at 3, at the White Hart Hotel, Leicester. Andrews, Leominster
Frost, John Stanton, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Fish Merchant. March 22 at 11, at office of Blake, Hall Quay, Yarmouth. Seppings, King's Lynn
Gamble, Hy Cutcliffe, Spurstowe rd, Hackney, Printer. March 19 at 1, at office of Shea, King William st
Gilbertson, Fras, North Duffield, York, Farmer. March 21 at 3, at the George Hotel, Selby. Gant
Greenwood, Wm, Bradford, York, Journeyman Dyer. March 20 at 2, at office of Harle, Dewhirst bldgs, Bradford
Ham, Septimus Thos, Farnborough, Surrey, Watchmaker. March 19 at 2, at offices of Philp, Pancras lane, Queen st
Heathcote, Thos, Ecclesfield, nr Sheffield, Police Constable. March 15 at 3, at offices of Robert, Bank st, Sheffield
Hincks, John Chas Hawkesford, Willenhall, Stafford, Attorney-at-law. March 20 at 12, at offices of Griffin, Bennett's hill, Birm
Irons, Wm, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Linen Draper. March 20 at 12, at offices of Nurse & Son, St James st, King's Lynn
Johnson, John, Sale, Chester, Commercial Traveller. March 11 at 2, at the Brunswick Hotel, Piccadilly. Mair, Macclesfield
Kirkpatrick, Fras, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Hosier. March 23 at 12, at offices of Barrow, Queen-st, Wolverhampton
Loder, John, Burnley, Lancashire, Ironmonger. March 27 at 3, at the Pack Horse Hotel, Sheffield. Nowell, Burnley
Love, John, Kingston, Surrey, Draper. March 18 at 11, at offices of Haigh, jun, King-st, Cheapside
Macquay, Peter, & Alfred Horne, Birm, Fender Makers. March 15 at at 12, at office of Griffin, Bennett's-hill, Birm
MacLeod, Norman, Birm, General Draper. March 20 at 3, at office of Jaques, Cherry st, Birm
Mann, Robt, Dean ter, Forest hill. April 2 at 2, at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Cordwell, College-hill, Cannon st
Masse, Joseph Fras Panlin, Upper Hornsey rise, Gent. March 27 at 4, at offices of Lewis & Co, Old Jewry
Mead, Isaac, Sherborne, Dorset, Innkeeper. March 23 at 12, at the Mermaid Hotel, High st, Yeovil
Miles, Jacob Hy, Birm, Comm Agent. March 16 at 12, at offices of Kennedy, Waterloo st, Birm
Mill, Jonathan, Westward Ho! Devon, Builder. March 20 at 11, at office of Smale, Bath House, Bideford
Milner, Albert John, Kinoulton, Notts, Farmer. March 25 at 12, at the King's Head Hotel, Loughborough
Monk, Wm, St Stephen's rd, Old Ford, Beer Retailer. March 28 at 2, at office of Phipps, Farringdon st

Moore, Hy, Coventry, Warwick, Brewer. March 19 at 3.30, at offices of Pierson, Jordan Well, Coventry. Rowlands, Birm

Packer, Wm, Notts, Boot Maker. March 22 at 12, at offices of Cranch & Rowe, Low pavement, Notts

Pendlebury, John, Smallware Dealer. March 28 at 2, at offices of Crowther & Co, Bath chambers, York st, Manch. Chew & Sons, Manch

Phillipson, Fredk, Gt Grimsby, Lincoln, Chemist. March 18 at 12, at offices of Grange & Wintringham, West St Mary's gate, Gt Grimsby

Rangdale, Jas Brogden, Manch, Comm Agent. March 22 at 3, at offices of Addleshaw, King st, Manch

Read, Jas Wm, Newport, Isle of Wight, Tobacconist. March 19 at 12, at office of Sole & Co, Aldermanbury. Hooper, Newport

Rome, Thos, Lpool, Cotton Broker. March 21 at 3, at office of Quinn, South John st, Lpool

Ruddle, Francis, and Francis William Ruddle, Hereford, Hatters. March 21 at 3, at the Green Dragon Hotel, Broad st, Hereford. James & Bodenham

Rutter, Geo Edwd, Plymouth, Devon, Fringe Manufacturer. March 22 at 12, at offices of Beer & Rundle, Ker st, Devonport

Shaw, Gideon, Castleford, York, Bootmaker. March 20 at 2, at offices of Boulton, Pontefract

Smith, Wm, Brighton, Sussex, Chemist. March 26 at 12, at offices of Smith & Co, Bread st, Cheapside. Lamb, Brighton

Snowdon, Thos, Woodfield crescent, Harrow rd, Builder. March 26 at 2, at the Guildhall Coffee-house, Gresham st. Preston, King's Arms yard

Solomons, Abraham, Broad st, Bloomsbury, Glass Merchant. March 22 at 2, at offices of Sydney, Leadenhall st

Taylor, Jas, York, Tobacconist. March 18 at 3, at office of Grayston, jun, New st, York

Taylor, Wm, Birm, Ironfounder. March 22 at 12, at offices of Grove, Bennett's hill, Birm

Tennant, John, Leeds, Ironmonger. March 25 at 3, at office of Messrs. Blackburn, Park-row, Leeds. North & Sons, Leeds

Thompson, Robt, Stanbridge rd, Putney, Sack Merchant. March 21 at 2, at office of Dubois, Gresham bldgs, Basinghall st. Maynard, Clifford's inn

Thomas, John Hy, Balham, Surrey, Linendraper. March 19 at 2, at office of Marshall, Hatton garden

Wall, Chas, Birm, Baker. March 22 at 3, at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birm

Ware, Richd, Diana pl, Euston rd, Lath Render. March 22 at 2, at offices of Gold & Son, Serjeants' inn, Chancery lane

Watmough, John, jun, Sheffield, Butcher. March 21 at 4, at offices of Clegg, Bank st, Sheffield

Watson, Thos, jun, Scarrington, Notts, Farmer. March 22 at 12, at offices of Belk, High pavement

Watts, Geo Wm, Bridgend, Glamorgan, Wine Merchant. March 21 at 12, at offices of Dix, Exchange bldgs, Bristol

Watts, Hy, Redbridge, Hants, Lime Merchant. March 20 at 12, at Old Furnival's Hotel, Holborn. Killby, Portland st, Southampton

Whitaker, Thos, Bath, Stonemason. March 18 at 12, at 4, St James's st, Bath

White, Obadiah, Matlock, Derby, Blacksmith. March 30 at 11, at the Duke William Inn, Matlock. Neale

Whittick, Hy, Queen's rd, West Chelsea, Builder. March 21 at 12, at offices of Roche, Old Jewry

Wilkinson, John Spencer, Doncaster, York, Grocer. March 20 at 12, at offices of Shirley & Atkinson, St George gate, Doncaster. Burdekin, & Co

Wishlade, Anne, Kington, Hereford. March 19 at 3, at the Talbot Inn, Kington. Cheese

Wolfsolm, Joseph, Birm, Jeweller. March 21 at 3, at offices of Saunders & Bradbury, Cherry st, Birm

Woodger, Frank, Scarborough, York, Fish Curer. March 22 at 11, at offices of Moody & Co. St Thomas st Scarborough

Wormald, Chas Fredk, Manch, Tin Packing-case Maker. March 21 at 3, at offices of Richardson, Manch

TUESDAY, March 12, 1872.

Barber, Chas Hy, Willingdon, Sussex, Clerk. March 25 at 3, at office of Coles, Eastbourne

Barrett, Arthur Hy, Exeter, Hatter. March 25 at 12, at offices of Tapley, Bedford circus, Exeter

Bennett, Thos Fras, Cheyne walk, Refreshment Contractor. March 27 at 2, at office of Tower, Lower Thames st

Bewley, John, Longnewton, Cumberland, Farmer. March 22 at 11, at offices of Carrick, Wigton

Bikker, Chas Hay Traise, jun, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Coal Merchant. March 23 at 11, at offices of Dallow, Queen sq, Wolverhampton

Blishen, John, Kingston-upon-Thames, Surrey, Butcher. March 27 at 3, at offices of Sherrard, Clifford's inn

Bolton, Geo, Rhyl st, Maidon rd, Kentish town, Corn Dealer. March 20 at 2, at offices of Morris, Jermyn st

Booth, Wm, Hanley, Stafford, Hosier. March 25 at 4, at 22, Cheapside, Hanley. Sherratt

Borrett, Isaac Rumsey, Cretingham, Suffolk, Blacksmith. March 26 at 12, at office of Pollard, St Lawrance st, Ipswich

Briggs, Jas, Fulham rd, Linen Draper. March 25 at 12, at office of Lucas, Maddox st, Regent st. Mason, Maddox st, Regent st

Brownbridge, John, Sheffield, Greengrocer. March 22 at 12, at office of Tattershall, Queen st, Sheffield

Butt, Fredk, Swansea, Glamorgan, Bootmaker. March 23 at 3, at offices of Hancock & Co, Guildhall, Bristol

Carter, Jas, Sunderland, Durham, Outfitter. March 23 at 10.30, at offices of Haswell, East Cross st, Sunderland

Chapman, Thos, Neville rd, Stoke Newington rd, Greengrocer. March 22 at 3, at the Londesborough Arms Tavern, Londesborough rd, Stoke Newington rd

Cooker, Robert, Stoney Middleton, Derby, Furniture Broker. March 23 at 12, at offices of Fernell, St James's st, Sheffield

Coley, Jas, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Hosier. March 16 at 11, at office of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Corrie, Josiah, Richmond rd, Islington, Clerk. March 21 at 3, at offices of Howell, Cheapside

Danson, John Anselm, Birkenhead, Chester, Painter. March 23 at 2, at office of Downham, Market st, Birkenhead

Crawford, Robert, & John Taylor, Norham, Northumberland, Fishmongers. March 19 at 2, at offices of Joel, Market st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Dawson, Geo, Chelmsford, Essex, Grocer. March 25 at 12, at offices of Carter & Bell, Leadenhall st

De Vries, Peter Klages, Gt Tower st bldgs, Beer lane, Provision Merchant. March 21 at 1, at 33, Gutter lane

Edwards, Jas, Swansea, Glamorgan, Butcher. March 20 at 12, at offices of Clifton & Woodward, Wind st, Swansea

Ellis, John, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Coal Dealer. March 26 at 11, at offices of Green, Darlington st, Wolverhampton

Evans, John, Newcastle Emlyn, Hotel Keeper. March 30 at 12.30, at Salutation Hotel, Newcastle Emlyn. Evans

Ginz, Jacob, St John's rd, Hoxton, Baker. April 4 at 3, at office of Holloway, Bail's Pond rd. Heathfield, Lincoln's inn fields

Golden, Jas Wm, Huddersfield, York, Agent. March 23 at 10, at office of Sykes, Market walk, Huddersfield

Golding, Geo Wm, Kentish Town rd, Butcher. March 19 at 11, at offices of Davis, Bedford row, Holborn

Groom, Josiah, Shrewsbury, Salop, Photographic Artist. March 21 at 11, at office of Morris, Swan hill, Shrewsbury

Hall, Chas, Hockerill, Herts, Wheelwright. March 29 at 11, at office of Godwin, St Thomas' st, Winchester

Harrison, Hy, & John Hy Harrison, Windsor, Berks, Builders. March 25 at 12, at office of Nicholson, Gresham st. Sole & Co, Aldermanbury

Hartley, Hy, Commercial pl, Plough rd, Rotherhithe, Provision Dealer. March 25 at 3, at offices of Sers, Lincoln's inn fields

Harvey, Hy, & Dani Lowe, Birm, Glass Dealers. March 19 at 3, at offices of Maher, Upper Temple st, Birm

Hawke, Jas, jun, Falmouth, Cornwall, Cordwainer. March 25 at 2, at offices of Jenkins, Post Office bldgs, Falmouth

Heath, John Hy, Strand, Chemist. March 21 at 2, at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Maniere, Gt James st, Bedford row

Hickman, Wm, Wolverhampton Stafford, Butcher. March 21 at 3, at offices of Stratton, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Hopkinson, Thos Chas, Stafford, Baker. March 25 at 12, at offices of Brough, St Mary's pl, Stafford

Horn, Wm, & Howard Gow, Lpool, Merchants. March 27 at 3.30, at offices of Yates, South John st, Lpool

Humphreys, Thos, Aston-juxta-Birm, Attorney's Clerk. March 22 at 3, at offices of Kennedy, Waterloo st, Birm

Johnson, Edward, Southampton bldgs, Chancery lane, Attorney-at-law. March 21 at 11, at offices of Davis, Bedford row

Johnson, Jonathan Geo, Brooke, Norfolk, Plumber. March 25 at 11, at offices of Winter & Frances, St Giles's st, Norwich

Jones, John, Shrewsbury, Salop, Draper. March 25 at 11, at office of Morris, Swan hill, Shrewsbury

Kenward, Robert, Euston rd, Stove Merchants. March 21 at 2, at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Maniere, Gt James st, Bedford row

Kitson, John, Rochdale, Lancashire, Fork Butcher. March 22 at 11, at offices of Roberts & Sons, John st, Rochdale

Langton, Thos, Thames st, Rotherhithe, Timber Merchant. April 4 at 12, at offices of Slater & Pannell, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st. Hewitt, Nicholas lane

Lightfoot, Thos, Higher Bebbington, Chester, Joiner. March 20 at 12, at offices of Brotherton & Hannan, Duncan st, Birkenhead

Lloyd, Lewis, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Bootmaker. March 23 at 11, at the Kentish Hotel, Tunbridge Wells. Copp, Essex st, Strand

Lowe, Wm, St Helen's, Lancashire, Saddler. March 27 at 3, at office of Evans & Lockett, Commerce chambers, Lord st, Lpool

Manser, David, Harrold, Bedford, Baker. March 21 at 2, at 12, Hatton garden. Marshall

Marcroft Zachariah, Rochdale, Lancashire, Fruiterer. March 29 at 3, at the White Swan Inn, Yorkshire st, Rochdale. Standring, Rochdale

Marks, Saml, Canton, nr Cardiff, Hotel Keeper. March 29 at 11, at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff

Mordaunt, Hy, Threadneedle st, Stock Dealer. April 5 at 2, at office of Pope, Gt James st, Bedford row

Mountford, Saml, jun, West Bromwich, Stafford, Wheelwright. March 25 at 11, at offices of Caddick, New st, West Bromwich

Nicholas, Wm, Luton, Bedford, Licensed Victualler. March 16 at 4, at office of Jolley, Guildford st, Luton

Onions, Wm, & Edwin Onions, Oldbury, Worcester, Ironmasters. March 23 at 12, at offices of Free, Bennett's hill, Birm. Coldicott & Canning, Dudley

Partington, Thos, & John Partington, Bradford, York, Boiler Makers. March 25 at 3, at offices of Hutchinson, Piccadilly chambers, Piccadilly, Bradford

Pitcairn, Hy Hunt, Leeds, Wine Merchant. March 21 at 11, at offices of Pullan, Park row, Leeds

Plummer, John, Bath, Butcher. March 23 at 11, at offices of Bartrum, Northumberland bldgs, Bath

Poole, John, Oxford, Greengrocer. April 6 at 2, at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Maniere

Raven, John Head, Norwich, Stationer. March 21 at 12, at office of Tillyard, Serjeants' inn, Chancery lane. Clabburn, Norwich

Reed, Jas Wesley, Hornsey Rise, Architect. March 25 at 2, at office of Banks, Coleman st. Harcourt & Macarthur, Moorgate st

Richards, Jas, Coleorton, Leicester, Comm Agent. March 21 at 3, at the Queen's Hotel, Ashby-de la-Zouch. Wilson, Burton-on-Trent

Richards, Wm John, Westbury-on-Severn, Gloucester, Accountant. March 25 at 11, at office of Jones, Eldon chambers, Gloucester

Roads, Anthony, Thornborough, Bucks, Farmer. March 25 at 12, at the White Hart Hotel, Buckingham. Stimson, Bedford

Robert, Louis, Birm, Boot Manufacturer. March 25 at 12, at the Queen's Hotel, Birm. Griffin, Birm

Rowe, Richd, Plymouth, Devon, Forage Dealer. March 27 at 11, at office of Curtis & Dawe, Courtenay st, Plymouth

Russell, Jas, & Wm Cotton, Birm, Printers. March 26 at 12, at offices of Morgan, Waterloo st, Birm

Sackett, Richd Hy, Margate, Kent, Baker. March 28 at 11, at 9, Churchfield pl, Margate. Gibson

Saunders, John, Bath, Grocer. March 25 at 1, at 3, Miles's bldgs. Gill & Bush

Savery, John, Southsea, Hants, Fish Merchant. March 19 at 3, at 3, Union st, Portsea. Feltham

Sharman, Danl, Northampton, Butcher. March 27 at 11, at offices of Jeffery & Son, Newland, Northampton
Shaw, Luke, Elland, nr Halifax, York, Woollen Manufacturer. March 14 at 12, at the Griffin Inn, Halifax. Norris & Co, Halifax
Sherlock, Jas, Derby, Brickmaker. March 28 at 11, at office of Briggs, Full st, Derby
Smith, Richd John, Victoria, rd Stoke Newington rd, Clerk. March 25 at 2, at offices of Crow, North rd, New Cross. Bellamy & Strong, Bishopsgate st Within
Smith, Wm, Shrewsbury rd, Bayswater, Tailor. March 27 at 3, at office of Brighten, Bishopsgate st
Smith, Wm, Wm Smith, jun, & Joseph Smith, Bradford, York, Tea Dealers. March 20 at 4, at offices of Berry, Charles st, Bradford
Stafford, Jas, Fulham rd, West Brompton, Boot Maker. March 27 at 3, at offices of Dyte & Leader, Fleet st. Jonas, King's Bench Walk, Temple
St Aubyn, Wm John, Devonport, Devon, Clerk in Holy Orders. April 5 at 12, at the Odd Fellows Hall, Ker st, Devonport. Beer & Rundle
Stocker, Wm Burbank, Gloucester, Tailor. March 27 at 12, at offices of Cooke, Pitt st, Gloucester
Thomas, John, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorganshire, Comm Agent. March 22 at 1, at offices of Thomas, Mill st, Pontypridd
Thomas, Thos Griffith, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Draper. March 28 at 12, at office of Jones, Pier st, Aberystwith
Tidman, Chas, Toperoft, Norfolk, Farmer. March 25 at 12, at office of Chittock, Redwell st, Norwich
Turner, Joseph. Middlesbrough, York, Labourer. March 30 at 11, at offices of Braithwaite & Co, Albert rd, Middlesbrough. Bainbridge, Middlesbrough
Veitch, Geo, Gateshead, Durham, Grocer. March 25 at 12, at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Weston, Chas Victor, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Tailor. March 26 at 11, at offices of Stephens, Bute crescent, Cardiff
Wilson, Richd, & Thos Bloodworth, Gt Bath st, Farringdon rd, Export Oilman. March 25 at 12, at offices of Jones & Hall, King's Arms yd, Moorgate st
Worth, John, Stalybridge, Cheshire, Corn Miller. March 26 at 3, at office of Sutton & Elliott, Brown st, Manch
Wright, Edwin, Wakefield, York, Glass Bottle Merchant. March 25 at 2, at offices of Stocks & Nettleton, Westgate, Wakefield
Yates, Alfred, Gt Titchfield st, Marylebone, Ironmonger. March 25 at 2, at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st
Young, Wm, Oxford, Tailor. March 26 at 12, at offices of Harford & Taylor, St Michael's chambers, Ship st, Oxford